

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 4.—OCTOBER—1913.

I.

THE TEST OF A PERMANENT CIVILIZATION.

CORNELIUS WOELFKIN.

By civilization we mean that state of society which has been redeemed from savage impulses and barbaric dominance. The tyranny that obtains among uncivilized peoples springs from two primary sources. First, there is the survival of the brute inheritance,—the animal instinct of self-preservation. This instinct assumes the form of aggression in the prowess of physical strength; and again it will be manifested in the timidity, retreat, or the subtle cunning of attack. But whatever the form, the instinct always acts in the interest of individual self-preservation. Second, there is the imposition of false belief,—a mental tyranny enslaving the better self through superstition. When truth emancipates the mind from the darkness and fear of irrational notions, and the better and generous impulses of the affections are given the controlling place in life, then the genius of civilization is born. The acquisition of knowledge, without an attending mastery of selfish propensities, is not civilization. And it is at this point where civilization is in danger of relapsing into a refined barbarism, and taking the backroad to decadence. Civilization involves the subjugation of the individual and selfish propensities, in

the interests of the social and communal good of our neighbors. Civilization is not born fullgrown. It is an evolution. It begins in the gradual movement of mind and heart. It begins in the individual who, discovering the luxury of light and love, begins to key life to the nobler impulses. Such a life becomes both repellant and attractive: it challenges both martyrdom and imitation. Having discovered the law of gaining the higher through losing the lower self, its spirit of sacrifice and service becomes contagious and begins to dominate the community. There is a subtle advantage which gathers about a man or community who follows the higher clue. This superiority is not physical or material,—though it may include that: but it is primarily moral. Many a vantage ground in history has been attributed to superiority of physical forces, which a keener analysis would reveal to be due rather to moral supremacy. Material force without spiritual reinforcement is shortlived.

When the genius of civilization is once born it grows. Its momentum knows no boundary, of clan, tribe or nation. Its spirit conquers area after area, until the race is baptized into its light. Today we do not think of civilization in the terms of a people or nation. We have no distinctive German, English, French or American civilization. We think of it in terms of hemispheres, and talk of "Western civilization." In this all our western nations are contributors and common heirs. The fruits of our western civilization are world-wide. The Orient has seen its benefit on the material side. The riches springing from commerce and industry; the advantages accruing from the genius of invention; the superiority through armament and military forces, have impressed the semibarbaric peoples of the East. We could earnestly wish that the spiritual dynamics, which have worked within our progress, had been just as apparent. It may be that they would never have inquired concerning the real spirit of civilization without these crass advertisements. But this is certain, the East is ready to sit at the feet of the West, to learn these higher arts of civilized

life, though they do not as yet inquire, concerning the motive power which gave our modern progress its history. With this attitude in the Orient, civilization may be said to belt the globe.

But is our civilization permanent? The question may seem preposterous. And yet it is worth while inquiring concerning those elements which make for strength and growth, and discover any tendency toward disintegration. We are very apt in assuming that our modern advancements cannot possibly fall upon decay. Any reactionary movement would simply indicate some little eddy in the tide. The stream itself cannot be dammed back. The progress may be transferred to others,—but to become lost seems unthinkable. Yet many wise men have grave fears, and are asking significant questions. We read our histories as echoes of the past, and seldom discover in them warnings for the present. Could we have heard the youth in ancient Memphis and Thebes converse, we never should have dreamed that modern explorations would have to dig through sand and rock, to find the relics of their onetime glory. Who among the Chaldean people ever supposed that the majesty of Babylon would be destroyed beyond our finding? The minstrels of history are sadly silent concerning the civilizations which flourished in Egypt, Chaldea and Tyre. A few monuments, tablets, curios and inscriptions are all that is left to kindle in our imaginations a fancy concerning those national glories, which the pride of their days deemed indestructible. Greece and Rome are much nearer to us, not in point of time, but in respect of knowledge. Their languages survive, and as in a mirror we see the dim outline of their proud yesterdays. Wherein were they behind us? The arts, philosophy and literature of ancient Greece, though buried for centuries in neglect and forgetfulness, found a resurrection in the renaissance. The genius for Law and the military strength of Rome made her sovereign of the world. Which of the Cæsars could have prophesied the dark ages? Yet luxury, selfish indulgence, tyranny, corruption and sin undermined it all, and the glory of the ancients was swallowed up in shame.

Why did not these civilizations maintain themselves, and keep their achievements in the currents of progress? Their ideals were high enough to insure permanence, if they could only get themselves into the lives and hopes of the people. But they were divorced from the daily strivings and regarded in splendid isolation. They ceased to inspire and only became forms of thought,—minus power. They were no longer the genius of life. They were the wardrobe, in which a dissolute and vicious age masqueraded their vices under the ideals of the virtuous men of old. Forms cannot long survive the life that gives them birth.

The laws that make for progress or decay are unchangeable. Unless we can avoid the sunken rocks on which the ancients struck, our modern civilization will also founder. The light of true worth flashes on many a page of our history, and we are not lacking in noble ideals. But are these the beacon guides of our path and the inspiration of our lives? Our forms alone cannot save us. We have laws enough on our statute books,—broken laws enough to make a millennium. There is no power in a law. A law is often framed and passed, not with a view of becoming operative; but with the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes, and detracting attention from the demand to the statute. Law has no power without public sentiment, and sentiment is often anesthetized by dead-letter law.

Is it not possible that civilization may be self-destructive? The very genius which slowly builds up a society may be employed in the interests of evil. The forces which blast out our rocks in the progress of engineering and building, may be diverted in making bombs for the destruction of buildings and lives. The very wisdom which can formulate law, can also be utilized in the circumvention of law. No sooner does legal skill discover a way of dissolving an institution or monopoly, than the same kind of skill anticipates the verdict by plans of reorganization, with enlarged powers of control. The powers of control and prohibition are always some years behind the

game, and the creative forces of selfishness seem always in the lead.

Our modern civilization is able to point backward, and assure us that many of the ancient evils, while not entirely banished, have nevertheless so fallen under the censure of social opinion that the practices are confined to the "under-world." But we are slow to recognize and deal with those new forms of evil which may invade and infest the "upper-world" for a generation, before we even awaken to their danger. The interdependence of our form of life has put many of our interests out of our hands. We no longer raise our produce in our own gardens. We no longer make our own garments. We have become dependent upon the markets and manufacturies. This interdependence has created opportunities for imposition. The selfishness of man has advantaged by these new conditions. As a means of protection we appoint commissions and officers of inspection. We have food inspection, factory inspection, tenement inspection, machinery inspection, insurance inspection, endless inspections. But what do all these inspections mean? They signify that the same impulses which live in forms of brute force among uncivilized society, survive in more refined and subtle forms in cultured society. Again the inspection itself becomes the occasion for added dishonesty, until the majority of inspection has fallen under suspicion of having been corrupted. So general has this practice become, that the social conscience has lain dormant, public sentiment fallen asleep, and the situation accepted as inevitable. "We are delivered to do these offenses." Consequently some sincere men are inquiring whether we have not gone over the brow of the hill and begun the decline.

It is true our intellectual renaissance is continuing. But unless our moral and spiritual redemption can keep pace with our mental growth, we build upon decaying foundations. Much of our intellectual advance is in a bulkhead compartment, isolated from any daily advantage, save being mental stimulus. Wherever it may be harnessed to the practical benefit of man

in material ways, it is at once in danger of being infected by selfishness and commercialized. In our law we designate crime by its peculiar forms and manifestation, rather than by motive. The old forms fall under censure and condemnation. Meantime the old motives are continually inventing new forms of sin, which it takes one generation to recognize, and another to condemn. The sneaking pickpocket, the bold burglar, the brutal knifebrawler, the angry or revengeful murderer, these form of criminality have fallen under the general ban, and a code of sanctions metes out punishment to such as are not clever enough to escape or circumvent the law. But the secret rebate, the dishonest rakeoff, the criminal neglect and legal violation with respect to safety-appliances on dangerous machinery, the adulterations in food and medicine, which sicken and kill, these new sins are not so vigorously and universally denounced in society. They work their havoc a long time before enough sentiment can muster to secure the recognition of law. Many of these sins cannot be overtaken at all. Just as public sentiment becomes focused to strike them, our very cleverness invents some new device of profiting self at the expense of society. Much of this modern sin is stretched out over so many agencies, that the matter of locating blame is next to impossible. Today we sin by syndicates. Stockholders own the corporations; directors demand dividends; the manager must achieve the desired ends; employees must submit to conditions; then something goes wrong, and where shall the jury lay the blame? There is so much of modern sin that can be termed "long-distance" sin. The victim is not near at hand; he is struck afar off. The manufacturer of adulterated and deadly foods and drugs never comes in contact with the invalids whom he undermines. He does not see the drug habit fastening the fangs of death in his victims, nor does he hear the lamentation of broken hearts over the untimely dead. If the owners of over insured boats could be near when the "coffin-ship" goes down; or if the proprietor of dangerous machinery could be by when the employee is hurt, there might

be some reaction and amendment. But long-distance sins lose an important dynamic of repentance.

There is no personal malice in these sins. In one street a man is in the pathway of his neighbor, who, annoyed and angry, shoots him down. In another street is a woman confused before an automobile going twenty miles an hour through a city thoroughfare. The one falls before the hot blood of anger, the other before the warm blood of speed. There is no malice in the second case. It is careless indifference. But the result is the same to the victims and family. The law may hang the murderer with pistol, and not even arrest the man-slayer with car. It lacked the momentary impulse of malice. The majority of new modern sins have no mark of Cain branded upon them, and consequently some of the greatest sinners are considered conventionally good people, and maintain good standing in polite social circles. Their sins are impersonal and pass into vague society. The guilt is veneered in so-called "acts of Providence." Many new sins are directed, not against persons, but institutions,—the very institutions which are the fruit and conservators of civilization. Wherever sin can flourish, civilization is threatened.

But cannot our religion save us? Religion is designed to redeem us from sin, and has not our religion sufficient power to insure the permanence of our civilization? History reminds us that modern civilization sprang out of a revival of Christianity; and if the genius of Christianity could only become vital in modern life, we should not hesitate to assert the permanence of civilization. But religion is either being ignored, or shelved in the realm of impracticable fancies. We are doing with it what the ancients did with their ideals. Early Christianity was a transforming power. Its environment was hard upon it, and therefore its vital forces were developed. It had a power of exclusion toward all that was false and wrong. But it had also a power of inclusion toward all that had a right attitude in matters of truth and right. The resistance which it met in the selfishness of man, was more

than compensated in those allies which dwell in the conscience and affections in man. But modern Christianity has had no shock from the outside world for eight centuries. This unassailed supremacy has worked two evils. Assuming its own exclusive and sovereign monopoly in truth, it has denounced all other forms of faith as error and superstition; and refusing its inclusive genius, it has lost its own perspective. Second, being free from external onslaughts, it has fallen into numerous and endless factions and strifes within itself. These bitter internal feuds have developed many contradictory forms, while slowly strangling the true life. In the primitive days, when we would have anticipated its being snuffed out by persecution, we behold it conquering. In the modern day when we naturally expect its triumph, we find it questioned, ridiculed and quietly ignored.

Many serious men are questioning the supremacy of Christianity in its present day form, and wondering whether it is not at the crossroads. Milton could not use the Copernican theory in his poetic theology, and much of our Christian theology is still Miltonian and fails to readjust itself to our latest renaissance. Consequently we are confronted with a non-Christian civilization, which is questioning the supremacy of Christianity. Today there are more Buddhists in the world than Christians. Have we ever looked this fact in the face, and tried an honest comparison? We need have no fear of such comparison,—but it needs to be made. The so-called "Yellow Peril" is something more than one of numerical strength. Why do we fear it? They are not Christians, but Buddhists mainly. Can Buddhism produce a supremacy that will threaten our western civilization?

The little empire of Japan has been a great surprise to observing people. That Japan should conquer the Chinese army occasioned no wonder among us. A regiment with modern Winchesters could demoralize the army of Xerxes. Japan had some of the tricks of western invention, and hoary China was unequal to the struggle. But when Japan tried her

strength against the Russian Bear, the surprise came to the world. And here it was not a question of numbers, and implements, but of strategy and, above all, moral force. There was no play to the gallery nor catering to a sensational press. She did not advertise herself to the nations. Army in the field, navy at sea, loyalists in home, all quietly patriotic, were united in one determined purpose. In the hours of trial, they were heroic; in the moment of victory self-contained. And when it came to the settlements of peace, they exhibited a highmindedness never surpassed in history, and so magnanimous that many sympathizers among Christian nations were chagrined that they did not put the screws to the fallen foe. This was not a mere incident or crisis in Japan's national history. Such a nation is not born in a day. The religion of Japan was one element in her strength. Buddhism has some things common with Christianity. It is cosmo-centric. And with the Japanese, this thought did not paralyze the interest and ambition of the individual, but enabled him to rise above all personal regard, appreciate the higher and universal good, and submit himself to this exalted ideal. Self-sacrifice for the common good is a cardinal principle with them. Education in Japan is not only compulsory, but it includes morals and ethics. The "Bushido" is the ethical ideal set before enlisted men in the army. Frugality, fealty and filial piety are combined with a spirit unmercenary, and indifferent to fate. Four cardinal virtues are inculcated and practiced: the sense of oughtness, gratitude, disinterestedness and loyalty. Art is the refining element in their education. Art is not a luxury with them, but a common possession. It is not an esoteric taste, but common to all. Their picturesque scenery and glory of flowers make it available everywhere. Hence they are not restless, discontented, and envious. They are content without rushing round for possessions and pleasure. Morality and art, a disciplined will, with the love of the beautiful, make for the strength of a people. And these are characteristic of the Japanese, not in spots, but as a nation. Here lay the secrets of her strength in the hour of her trial.

Contrast with this condition the fact that with us religion is largely ignored or idealized; our educational systems afraid of the intrusion of moral and ethical training, the love of art confined to classes, our lack of national ideals and the decay of will power in our cities, and we have some occasion for serious consideration.

Is then Christianity at the crossroads? Has it lost its one-time power which inspired our modern civilization? No, the Christian genius is the same. But it has been substituted by forms which cannot save us. Our theological jealousies and ecclesiastical schisms have made us trust to doctrinal patter to form our moral manhood.

Civilization, if it is to be permanent, needs constant regeneration. In ignoring or departing from the vital forces of Christianity, it is cutting itself off from the source of its power. Like a train switched from its drawing motor, it may run a while on the momentum of the past, but it must come to a halt. No civilization can stand without a supreme emphasis upon spiritual ideals. And apart from the Christian faith, western civilization has no such ideal. Lacking such an emphasis what goal can there be for civilization? Here we have no answer. The deepest questions are neglected by secular learning. And if civilization has transcended our Christian faith, it should have better answers for inquiries of the soul.

But has our Christianity power to quicken our modern day? Is it not often like salt that has lost its savor? And if so, wherewith shall it be salted? So then religion must rejuvenate itself. It too must experience the new birth. The new birth of religion will not come by either revivals of the old theology or clever restatements of a new theology. Theology is the mental dress of religious ideas. But if the religion itself is not vital and living, the theology, old or new, is only its shroud. Religion must come to its rebirth by a new vital experience of its life in every generation. The youth of every age must discover it for themselves, and work it out in the tests of daily life. Our elders and parents may give us tra-

ditional forms of religious experience, which have verified themselves in their experience. But these at best can only be clues for us, putting us on the trail. But at last, what becomes religion, real religion for us, must issue from working out our own salvation with reverent earnestness. True religion is a fact in human life. And facts must ever submit themselves to test. In our modern world no scientist will rest upon an untried theory. Hypotheses must stand the strain of facts. Truth survives the hardest tests possible. Nothing has value that cannot abide the test of honest experiment. It is so with religion. And religion welcomes this test. It asks to be taken out of the classroom of theology, and be subjected to the strain of daily life. The Christian formula to be tried in the laboratory of daily experience is very clear. "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know the doctrine." An attitude of openmindedness and a willingness to know and do the divine will, shall be rewarded with knowledge. This knowledge must then be incarnated in humility and service toward our fellow man.

Modern civilization can only be permanent, as the spirit of Jesus infuses it with his own life. He went about doing good. In so doing he humbled himself and took on him the form of a servant. It was the spirit of God, living and serving in the form of man,—divinity clothed with humanity. Anyone could be a god beyond the stars. But to be godlike in human flesh is to achieve abiding glory. In humble service, Jesus was following some profound law of the kingdom of God. There can only be one law for Master and disciple. The common people heard Jesus gladly, because he humbled himself to understand and serve them, and this attitude is the law of reconciliation and progress.

Everywhere we find society segregated. Some arbitrary conditions of modern life make us interdependent. But beneath this order, we have classes with clashing interests. The religious, industrial, political and social worlds are divided, and antagonistic. Our selfinterests and vanity keep us from under-

standing one another. As men differ from us we call them queer, peculiar, cranky and even enemies. Humility and service is our only hope of reconciliation.

In religion, for example, a man belongs to a narrow, arbitrary, and dogmatic sect. I may regard him as prejudiced and bigotted. But I can never bridge the gap by telling him so. But if through an act of vicarious imagination I can think myself through his antecedents and into his place, my sympathy will awaken. If I will humble myself to learn of him I will get his point of view, and then I may serve his highest good. The same rule avails toward a man in the liberal wings of religious espousals. Every man, conservative or radical, orthodox or liberal, believer or infidel, is what he is because of certain antecedents. We never can help him until we sympathetically understand these. And we never can know them unless in humility we are willing to be taught, and ready to help.

This same law must be applied to one of the vexing problems within our nation, that of immigration. The immigrant complicates all our conditions and relations as a people. He modifies our industrial, political and religious situation. What shall be done with him? We have not been able to keep him out, and we do not wish to do so now. But we cannot let him come without assimilating him. In this process both he and we will have a hard time of it. He must be readjusted. And we must humble ourselves to understand and serve him. His heredity, traditions and temperamental makeup, cannot be shaken off in a day. Let us think ourselves into his place, and we will appreciate the difficulty of his situation and of our task.

All the institutions of modern life are beset with similar difficulties. And the spirit in which we deal with them will determine whether our movement shall advance or retrograde. Arbitrary force and dogmatic opinion cannot establish our growth. Permanence can only be secured, as a spirit of sympathetic and brotherly regard becomes the genius of all life and

effort. Selfishness is the instinct of savagery and barbarity. And if it prevails under the guise of culture, it is still the survival of our brute inheritance, despite its more artistic forms. And when its yoke becomes unbearable, the passions of a plebeian mob can overthrow in a month or year, the civilization that was centuries abuilding.

The test of a permanent civilization will be the possession and dominance of a spirit which knows the divine birthright in the human soul, and ever reaches up and out for the realization of the divine image in the human heart. On the downward side, that same spirit reaches out hands of sympathy toward all men, and seeks their transformation into that same godlike strength and beauty of character. It is that spirit which loves God and seeks first his kingdom and righteousness; and loving the neighbor as ourselves, daily waits and serves, in the spirit of Jesus' prayer, "Thy kingdom come: Thy will be done in earth as in heaven." Here is the law of permanence; and the test of our civilization will turn upon our ability to perpetuate the mystery and marvel of the Incarnation, along the line of human history and experience.

NEW YORK.

II.

THE MINISTER'S TASK IN THE FIELD OF THEOLOGY.

R. F. REED.

The minister's work is not confined to the field of theology. There are a number of other well-defined duties to which he must attend. The minister who would be of help unto men in spiritual things certainly needs to be a pastor. One of the underlying reasons for his interest in this feature of the office lies in the fact that he must know his people in order to be of service to them in the sanctuary.

Then again in our day the minister is supposed to be an organizer. Whatever names may be given to the various organizations, modern conditions in church life call for a division of every congregation into a certain number of groups of people, young and old, every one of which is to occupy a distinct sphere in the life of the congregation, and to attend to its own special work. After a congregation is thus grouped, sometimes with the consent or at the suggestion of the minister in charge, as frequently against his better judgment or even actual protest, he is looked upon as the one man who is to direct all this machinery, and to see to it that, at all times, it runs smoothly and without undue friction. This of course means that in a peculiar manner he must possess administrative ability. Thus is constituted at once quite a task for many a one. For only too often the various parts of such a mechanism are gotten up and put together very hastily. Hence the machinery nearly always runs only a short time until it is worn out. Then necessarily it breaks down. This marks the beginning of trouble and in some instances also the beginning of the end. For unfortunately for the minister many people

as yet fail to appreciate the situation thus brought about in the work of a congregation. Only a few weeks since when a certain minister left his charge—a man whom the church at large regards as successful—it was said frequently in the community where he served, “he is a poor manager and no financier at all.” Nevertheless in our day there seemingly must be quite a number of organizations within every congregation, a certain number of movements, all of which in large part are dependent upon the minister for their success if not for their very life.

But whatever else the minister may have to do he certainly is to make known unto men the will of God. He is a man who comes from God, who knows God, who associates with God, who can take his people by the hand and lead them into the presence of God and enable them to look upon life together with all the problems that belong to it in the light of heaven with the assurance that their Father is interested in them and all the affairs of their life. The minister's social powers may rightly help him in his work, but his success is after all only temporal and superficial, so long as it is built upon any other foundation than upon the powers that are his as a man of God. In relation to his people he is primarily not a social factor but the pastor, and his office owes its power to his familiarity with, and efficiency in, spiritual matters.

Again the minister has no right to lend his influence to organizations that now exist, or help create new ones, to fall in line with new movements no matter how they originate or what is claimed for them, until he is convinced that by so doing he will be instrumental in making the will of God known more fully to those who know it only in part, and make it known more readily unto a larger number of people. He is a man of God even here and cares not for organizations or movements as such, but only as they serve to bring in more and not less speedily the kingdom of God.

The minister is a messenger come from God. In the degree that he employs efficient methods of work, knows the people

whom he is to serve, and then has a message for them that comes to him from God, or in other words a message that he is certain is vital and one that his people must hear, and thereupon goes about his work as one who recognizes the importance thereof, in this degree will he succeed in his calling.

What now is to be the minister's message? How does he obtain it? Was it delivered once for all unto men? Is there as it were a reservoir of truth pertaining to God, man, the world, and these in manifold relations? And if so what more therefore does the minister need to do than to go to this reservoir and dip into it and hand out unto men vessels filled with its contents? Or, on the other hand, instead of being static and for many a one lifeless, is the message not a growing, vital, dynamic one? Does it not come anew to every generation of men? What part does the servant of the Lord have in formulating it? Is it not essential for him to fulfill certain conditions in order to become one of God's chosen workmen?

These questions indicate that the minister has his task to perform; that there is a task for him in the field of theology. Either before he takes up his work, or after he has entered upon his chosen calling, he must answer questions such as these for his own satisfaction at least. He is supposed to think upon the eternal verities: work out the problems of life as he knows it in relation to time and eternity with the help that the revelation of God in the fullest sense affords him. In a word he must think, think often, think constantly, think deeply upon the subject of God in his relation to man and the world in which he lives. Otherwise he certainly will not have a vital message for his people. And such thinking makes him a theologian, at least after a fashion. But there is a disposition on the part of a certain class of men to-day to make light of theology, pretending in this way to magnify the cause of religion. It is true, religion is primarily a life lived in the presence of God. But at the same time it is difficult to see how any one can go on very far in religion without thinking about it. And thus we have the germs of theology. All think-

ing people therefore have some sort of theology. And the minister of the word who Sunday after Sunday speaks upon some phase or other of the great subject of religion cannot help but be a theologian. His theology may be old, it may be new, in either case it may be crude, the various parts may not fit into one another, but nevertheless the very fact that he preaches makes him a theologian.

Ever since the first appearance of religion therefore, *i. e.*, ever since God manifested his presence unto men, and they in turn reflected upon the revelation thus granted, theology had its beginning; but no more than its beginning. Since then it has undergone development. If men from age to age were surrounded by the same influences, had to contend with the same difficulties, were asked to solve identically the same problems, and received no light in addition to that granted unto others before them, no help from their environment, made no intellectual and moral progress, were altogether stationary, then very likely the theology of the age of King David, *e. g.*, would be largely the theology of the age of Jesus Christ, and no doubt also that of the twentieth century. But men are influenced by their environment. They study the deep things of God in the light of the harm or the help they receive from their surroundings. Therefore every age has in a certain sense its own peculiar theology. And it may rightly be assumed that the minister of the gospel in view of his recognized religious leadership be thoroughly familiar with the theological ideas and the religious ideals prevalent in his age.

What then is to be the minister's task in the field of theology? There are at least two answers to this question. The one is this. He is to examine and master the theology of the past, that of the fathers, the theology that was tried and found not wanting, the theology that served its day well and stood the test of time. This is to be his foundation. While he is not to preach it, nevertheless it is to be the background of his thinking, and intelligent people who hear his sermons are to recognize the skeleton upon which his ideas are built. Then

he is also expected to guard the treasure that he has inherited from the past against all encroachments from without, due to newer light and modern discoveries and advanced methods of study, all regarded too often as so many devices on the part of the powers of evil. According to this view truths were revealed unto men in past ages; after that they were worked out by giant minds into a system; finally they were collected in the classic works of theology. Hence we now have a reservoir of truth that the minister is called upon to protect from pollution. He is to satisfy his own thirst by making use of its contents, and after that when tested and approved by him he is expected to hand them out to the children of men of his day. Thus he will help not only to maintain the Kingdom of God, but will also be an instrument in God's hand whereby the cause will be advanced. In a general way this is a picture of the conservative theologian, and I meant to be altogether fair. Great many men, too many I am certain, feel called upon to assume such an attitude in the field of theology. They believe it to be their duty to guard jealously that which they have received from the past, and they look upon all suggestions coming to them from without as unfriendly and prompted not by the spirit of the author of truth, but by that of the enemy of all good. For such men there is indeed a task in the field of theology—one altogether too difficult for any being whether man or angel.

The attitude of mind just sketched can be justified only on the claim that as in the case of the literature of revelation there was a creative period, so in the case of theology there was a time when by reason of special gifts from God, or exceptional qualifications of heart and mind, men were peculiarly endowed to work out and pass on to future generations a theology that was absolutely perfect from the first, and that for this reason it cannot be improved and therefore ought not to be tampered with. But such a thing has happened in connection with none of the other sciences. And it is a very difficult matter to persuade men who are of a scientific bent

of mind that it has happened in theology. A distinguished man of science has been quoted as saying to the graduates of a technical school: "We old fellows have hard work to keep up with the advances of this generation in scientific theory and technical practice, and we strain every nerve to maintain our place as learners." And to the harm of not only theology, but I believe, religion as well, the impression is abroad that in the sphere of theology there is no room for a wide-awake mind; that the attitude above set forth is the prevailing one; that the answer given as to the task of the minister is the only one there is.

However there is another and, I am confident, a better answer. It is to be found in the position of the scholar who while he appreciates the great value of the past in the sphere of religion and theology nevertheless does not believe that God was partial to former generations of men as over against men of this day. The fundamental assumption of present-day thinkers is that God is a God that moves onward in his great work among men and in behalf of men and that therefore his final and most helpful word to man is to be looked for in the present and in the future rather than in the past. This age does not want to dispense with the revelation of the past. For it, the records of the past are rich treasures. The Bible is unique in the realm of religious literature. No students in the sphere of spiritual things have turned back more eagerly and more hopefully to the sources of the Christian religion than those of to-day, or have done more to bring out the permanent value of the contributions of Jesus to the religious life of mankind, or have esteemed more highly the records that contain the story of the life and works of Jesus. "Yet," as has been said, "the documents of revelation are nothing but the deposit of some part of the characteristic impulse of personality, the reminiscence of it, the interpretation of it, the comment upon it, with such fidelity as earnest men are capable of, but with such errors also and idiosyncrasies as nothing human ever quite escapes." In spite of all the uncalled-for criticism

hurled against the modern Biblical student he yields second place to no one in his sincere appreciation of the word of God. His view as to the origin of the Bible, many of its authors, date of composition of the various parts, occasion, relation of the several portions, relative importance of one part of a book as compared with the remainder thereof, what is essential and what only incidental even though found in the Bible, may be very different, very often is very different from that entertained by students in days gone by. His sense of proportion is different from that of the fathers. But he believes that he has at least as much right to his view as men formerly had to theirs. Furthermore he has the firm conviction that he has penetrated the heart of the matter—that he has come as near to the teachings of the Bible as men have ever approached them. He does not glory however in this as though it were entirely due to his own efforts. He realizes that he has been able to attain unto his position only because of the labors undertaken and carried forward to a relatively successful end by predecessors in the work. He therefore gives due credit to such men, but cannot get away from the fact that to be true to himself it is necessary for him to insist on his own interpretation. And all this is nothing more nor less than the firm conviction that God carries on his great work of revelation and salvation in and through consecrated men of this generation as He in past generations carried on that work with the help of the same kind of men: that God speaks unto servants of his to-day who are willing to listen to Him as He spoke unto his servants in the eighteenth century, the sixteenth century, the sixth century, the first century, as well as He spoke to his servants among every generation of men from the very beginning. It means that God is never idle, and that his labor is not in vain, but ever growing. And thus his power, love, and excellency are being unfolded more and more from age to age. And therefore the task of the minister is certainly not that merely of a custodian of the oracles of God, a jealous guardian of the things delivered unto the saints. It is not that of a worshipper

of the past. But it is that rather of an honest and consecrated workman of the Lord who while truly mindful of the past and its contributions, labors faithfully and patiently in the present and is certain of God's presence and benediction upon him and his efforts.

As a man with his own task the minister has peculiar qualifications. First of all comes spiritual mindedness; not only a liking for spiritual things but in a marked degree an aptitude to know and appreciate them; a heart attuned to God; a mind open to religious truths. As the historian has a historical sense that enables him to discover facts of historical value from among the many that would only serve to confuse another lacking this qualification so the minister needs a sympathy with or a sense for facts of religious value. This power can of course be cultivated. It is a pity that too often the cry is made on the part of men who see danger in what is known as the liberal view that such spiritual mindedness is absent from the men who uphold it. In some communities a man's spirituality is heavily discounted when he is known to be in sympathy with liberalism. But barring a comparatively small number of present-day writers on theological subjects as a class it would be difficult to find a group of men more deeply spiritual or more sincerely devoted to what they believe to be their God given work. Among the professors with whom it was my privilege to associate—pardon this personal reference—and I had a larger number of such instructors than the student as a rule has, none impressed me and others at the time as more genuinely spiritual than one who was accused of heresy and practically driven out of his church. It is folly for any school of thought in the theological world to raise the cry that only such men as are identified with their views are pious and that all others lack piety. To be pious in all cases demands of the Christian that he seek after God, and that he desire to see Him as He is and not as any one particular established faith portrays Him. And from this viewpoint piety certainly is not wholly to be found with either the one or the other party in theology.

Secondly, in order to accomplish his task the minister is in need of mental alertness. The student of theology must keep awake, and have eyes that see and ears that hear and a heart that feels. As men who succeed today in any line of work must make use of all their faculties so the minister needs to be equally active and alert at all times, fertile in resources, quick to learn, and ready to apply what he has learned. Jonathan Edwards as a young man wrote, "I observe that old men seldom have any advantage of new discoveries, because these are beside a way of thinking they are used to. Resolved, if ever I live to years, that I will be impartial to hear the reason of all pretended discoveries, and receive them, if rational, how long soever I have been used to another way of thinking." Some such attitude of mind the minister of today more especially is in need of. For to my knoweldge no student of Edwards accuses him of being mentally indolent. Men have a right to demand of the minister in things spiritual, things that he claims are vital to all men in time and through eternity, that he be mentally awake and keep abreast of the times. The value of such eager, active, wide-awake personalities endowed with initiative has for some time been fully recognized in all other spheres of activity. Why not then in the sphere of religion? It is not essential that the minister should be a genius but highly important that he should be at least a live man.

The world permits the physician who makes his rounds from one patient to another year in and year out, hardly ever varying his prescriptions, always administering the same pills and nostrums when the same symptoms are supposed to be at hand, not trying in any way to keep up with the times in his profession, paying no attention to the startling discoveries in medicine made year after year, letting many a one die before his time whose life undoubtedly might have been spared had he moved along with the times in his chosen calling, content to make a living, and keeping the benefits of the advancements made from time to time in his profession entirely out of the reach of the patients among whom he moves and who have learned to

place confidence in him largely because they know him for many years as a regularly authorized physician, the world in which he moves permits such a one to go unmolested. While he does some good and helps mankind in a limited way he after all does not take the place among men that he ought to take. He should really quit his profession and let some one else take his place who would gradually let the people have the benefit of the steady advancement made in the medical world. If not this, then it is high time for him to arouse himself. But unfortunately for his people too often he is not conscious of his short-comings professionally. This age demands of its physicians that they give to the public the very best service of which they are capable, however lenient in their demands the particular communities in which they practice may be.

Why should the demand upon the ministry be any less? Why should the world be satisfied with a minister who is professionally asleep? Men are amused at the character who finds it difficult to keep awake. Yet for some men it appears an impossible task to keep awake theologically. Why should not a servant of the Lord of this type feel himself wholly out of place in his office? Why should any one ever dream of arriving at conclusions early in his ministry that will stand the test of his entire period of service? Yet is it not true in the case of at least some men that for them the days of study came to an end simultaneously with the Seminary days? It is absurd to think that even the very best teacher whom the world has ever known is able to send out into active life his students with their theology so well fashioned that it may be regarded as complete and final; to send out his students not so well but so peculiarly equipped that they are forever afterwards exempt from all independent efforts, that men and women unto whom they preach will sit in the pews and listen to them Sunday after Sunday and be mentally and even spiritually contented, men and women who themselves are active, energetic and mentally alert. Theological professors in this age know their place and work so well that it becomes more

and more difficult to find any who look upon their calling in such a light. They of this type used to exist, but happily they are fast dying out, if not already extinct. The minister young or old who seems to think that the books he studied while in the seminary will answer his and his people's purpose unto the end of his ministry has no one but himself to blame if the end comes closely upon the heels of the beginning. Better for him to sell such books when leaving school, or at least shortly afterwards, and from time to time buy new ones treating of the same subjects, and work them over. And unless a man knows of what value old books are this process will have to be repeated very often in the course of a life time. For in theology very few books if any at all are final, have said the last word that can or will be said on the subject of which they treat. It has been said: "This age does not look back upon the past as the golden age, and calls that institution or doctrine most pure and helpful which can be shown to have changed least from the time of its birth or its promulgation. It looks forward to the future for the clearest manifestation of truth, and puts the absolute at the end of the world process rather than at the beginning." But it does not follow that the minister who wishes to keep abreast of the times must, for example, buy all the works in dogmatic theology that leave the press. That were an impossible task. But it does follow that at least every few years some well-selected representative work in dogmatics be gone through by him as carefully as ever he studied the text-book on that subject while at school. Of course the same procedure is called for also in connection with all the other branches of theological thought, such as ethics, apologetics, old and new testament interpretation.

Thirdly, the minister who desires to wield a power for good among thinking people must be honest, fairminded and sincere. His mind must be unbiased, free from prejudices. He needs to be honest in his search after the facts of theology and having found them he must be equally honest in sharing them with his people. Theology is a science. It is called, used to be,

the queen of the sciences. It is the very nature of a science to be open to all facts pertaining to it. Men have no more right in theology than in connection with any other branch of knowledge to shut out fresh facts discovered from time to time, no matter whether they may or may not fit in with the sum total of knowledge already accessible to man in that particular field. Such new facts may play havoc with the system of truth that men have built up with the help of the facts previously known to them. They frequently compel men to begin anew some part of the work that they up to that time regarded as built upon the solid rock of eternal truth. But sooner or later such a work would totter and go down, and unquestionably it is better that men should see their mistake in time and tear down the structure already reared upon a false foundation and build it upon a more permanent basis than that they should dwell contentedly in a building whose foundation is laid in the sinking sand. We all admit that it is very inconvenient to be obliged after a time to tear down and begin the work over again; and in addition to this it is very costly. But a structure that is to last, or to be safe while it does last, must rest upon a solid foundation. At least the builder would hardly ever be forgiven were he to put the building upon a foundation known by him to be unsafe. And his act in doing so would be no less than criminal.

The minister ought to walk in the new light that from time to time appears upon the horizon of the theological world. And as an honest man if that light is a blessing to him he must let his people share it with him. The chances are that he has among them those who are already enjoying the same light. While no doubt there are some in the flock to whom it will come for the first time and perhaps be more or less disturbing. But whether or not so, what has come home to the messenger of the gospel as the truth it is not for him to withhold from any one out of fear that it will do him more harm than good. That matter rests with the Author of all truth, and He always takes care of his own. Even von Hartman "expresses a pious

belief in a Providence which will take care that the anticipations of the quiet thinker shall not disturb the course of history by giving premature currency to them."

The minister of the gospel is a shepherd. The shepherd looks after the flock. It is his duty to see to it that the sheep have an opportunity to find pasture that will afford nourishment. Therefore he leads them into green pastures. Some plants, very few though, are harmful to the flock. What now is to be his attitude toward them? Is he to root them up? Or more practically is he to keep his sheep away from the places where they grow? He does neither of these things. As a rule either by experience or by instinct the sheep will let alone, strictly alone, the weeds that afford no nourishment for them, nibbling the herbs all around it but never touching the dangerous plant. It is folly for the shepherd to have any concern about his sheep in this regard. For the sheep are provided by nature against danger from this source. The shepherd's duty is to lead them forth where the pasture is green, into the best field available at the time according to his judgment, and then let them feed upon what their animal nature tells them is wholesome.

Again the minister is a sower and deeply interested in rich harvests. Certainly he sows what has been tested for many seasons, and has been found of value. However there is no use, for example, in holding on to a particular brand of wheat after his neighbors all about him, or even only one of them, have found another that he too may have at a nominal cost for the asking, one that is in every way superior to the old.

But on the other hand to be honest as a thinker along theological lines does not imply that the man of God must accept as final every discovery, or supposed one, in the field of theology; that every view of God in his manifold relations to the world and man advocated by any and every writer must at once be accepted and hailed as superseding all others, and therefore must be proclaimed from the pulpit upon the first opportunity. Such a procedure would be far worse on the

part of the preacher than for him to become thoroughly grounded in a few fundamentals and hold on to them in spite of all new light, real or supposed, coming in from time to time. The pulpit is not to serve as an opportunity for the preacher to let his people, the public, know what he reads day by day. Yet as an intelligent person, a man of culture and one who enjoyed and still enjoys rare privileges as a student, he is to use his God given powers as a thinker, exercise his judgment, and with the help of the spirit, in the light of his own experience and that of others he is to determine whether or not the new truths are really such or merely the wild fancy of some person who from all appearances is bent more upon creating a sensation in the world of theological thought than upon letting men have the benefit of new light. Only after he is certain in his own heart and mind of the truth, *i. e.*, after he has assimilated it, is he to offer it without hesitation to the flock.

Questions of criticism I am certain have no place in the pulpit. Such questions, for example, as to whether the Patriarchs were individuals or merely tribal names are as a rule of more than ordinary interest to the studious minister of the word, but they have no claim upon the pulpit alongside of the gospel of God. Even the question as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, which has ceased to be one among the best students of the Old Testament, is not a subject for the preacher to discuss from the pulpit. The same principle applies in connection with similar questions pertaining to the New Testament. When in the pulpit it is the preacher's privilege to make clear to the people before him the great spiritual lessons taught by the men of whom the Pentateuch treats; teach the lessons the characters of the several books illustrate with all the powers he can command; preach the eternal truths that the books of the Bible set forth with all the passion and persuasive force he possesses. The Pentateuch, for example, teaches valuable lessons for all time, no matter who wrote it. In the pulpit however there is no need of discussing its author.

But if in the class room, at the teacher's meeting, in the training class, in conversation with an individual who reads and thinks, he is asked for his opinion it is his duty to give his view, what he in his own heart honestly believes and has accepted and finds helpful, and then have no fear of results. So also when called upon to write for secular papers or theological quarterlies. It is certainly a mistake for any minister to go on the assumption that while it may be perfectly proper for him to entertain certain views of the Bible, of God, or of any subject pertaining to religion in his study, or in the presence of his colleagues, it would not do to maintain the same views in the presence of cultured laity, especially not if they are of his own flock. Just at this point some men give occasion for the accusation of insincerity that now and then is brought against the ministry.

But unless the minister studies and keeps himself informed he has no right to pronounce as unfounded and even ridiculous if not ludicrous the conclusions of men whose work commends itself as worthy of serious consideration on the part of thinking people. And unless he has actually studied the particular question concerned he ought to have the grace and the courage to acknowledge his want of sufficient information to express an opinion that might have value. It is not good judgment to say the least for the busy minister who has but limited time and ability and equally limited opportunity for study to take a stand for example either for or against the currently accepted relation between the Synoptic gospels and the fourth. When asked for his opinion the only fair position for him to take is not to make light of the problem and thus try to belittle those who make an effort to solve it. But he ought to state the case as well as he can, give fairly as far as he is capable the arguments pro and con, indicate his own preference at the time if he has any, and then gracefully acknowledge however his inability to decide permanently either one way or the other.

History teaches that the men of the past who had a message for their day were those who did more than simply hold on to

that which they received from their predecessors. They did this. But they also more or less freely criticized the religious product of preceding ages and emphasized and held out unto men as worthy of claim upon them only such portions of tradition as according to their view were adapted to the needs of their own generation. The prophets of the Old Testament are conspicuous examples of this class of men. The greatest of all teachers followed this course. So did also his disciples, notably St. Paul. The prophets, St. Paul and the men associated with him in early Christianity were all heretics—so regarded in their day. And nearly every prominent teacher since the days of St. Paul has been a defender of only such elements of the faith once delivered unto the fathers as appealed to him as such, and on the other hand freely criticized other portions thereof and added thereto such new interpretations as he felt certain it was his duty to offer as a servant of God. Only in this way can there be progress.

We have a comparatively recent illustration of what will happen when theological leaders, men who are called into the ministry, refuse to keep step with the world of thought in which they live. I refer to the New England Theology. The theologians of New England, and among them were active pastors, took for granted that their theology was substantially final, as the Germans say "fertig." Yet this wonderful system of thought collapsed. Today it is a matter of history—no longer of life. Why this passing feature? For this reason. It was a theology that failed to adapt itself to new conditions. It saw fit to ignore almost all new light that came to men of that day. Its advocates had no room for the freedom of the will and man's responsibility for his deeds as emphasized by the Armenian theologians. Nor did they find a place for the doctrine that calls man an inalienable child of God as taught by the Unitarians. Nor again could they see any value in the teaching of the Universalists who insisted upon the doctrine that God loves man with a love that will not let him go. These defects together with others kept the New England theology

stationary while thinking people were rapidly moving on. Of course in time it was left behind and men now view it as a system of thought that had its day but for us has ceased to be.

But what of the theology that has taken its place? They say that the religious life of the New England States today, especially the organized life as it comes to view in the various churches in the way of attendance upon divine services, is not at all flourishing. In the days of the New England theology on the other hand the churches were filled. Jonathan Edwards, Joseph Bellamy, Nathanael Emmons and others preached to crowded houses and the people who came to services knew how long they would continue. We are assured that today the services throughout Eastern Pennsylvania are well attended as compared with those of the New England States, though only a very few of us are obliged Sunday after Sunday to turn many worshippers away. The fathers were interested, the children are not. Now the question arises: Is it not better after all to have a theology that will interest the people and from all appearances at least help them in their daily walk and life, than to have one that is modern but has no or but little interest for the laity and seemingly is of help unto but a small circle of people?

This is a question more or less involved and no less difficult. We have no right to assume however that if the former theology were still in power that the children of the parents of the days when it held sway would be interested in it as much as were the parents themselves. There are reasons to believe that the children would take a deeper interest in religion than they do if it were not for the conviction that the position held and so strenuously, confidently, dogmatically defended by their fathers was an erroneous one. May not the religious condition of things in New England today be explained as a reaction? At least it will not do for the conservative element to put the blame upon the new movement. The advocates of the progressive ideas might claim that the theology that served

its day well was held on too long; men championed it when it had become inadequate to meet the wants of another time.

Of course I am not unmindful of the fact that the change that took place in the theological thought of New England was inevitable. The very presence of the theology that prevails there today proves that the Puritans and their descendants kept pace with the onward march of the times. The fathers did their part—the only practical thing they could do. The children in turn are doing their part, *i. e.*, they think and speak well of the fathers, but at the same time look and must look at the great spiritual facts of life in the only light in which God permits them to see such facts. And therefore no effort at adaptation on the part of the really great New England theologians would have fitted the theology of Calvin and Edwards into the religious life of the twentieth century. And from this viewpoint we cannot blame the fathers as having failed in their task. We simply have to record the great change that took place in the world of thought among the same people after the fulness of time had come.

But what is to be the attitude of the minister of Christ to the tendencies in the thought world at this time? What is his task at present? There are men in our day who have no interest in discussions relating, for example, to the miracles of the Bible, the genuineness of the accounts of creation, man's descent from Adam and Eve. They care not whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch; nor whether the book of Isaiah was written by the prophet whose name it bears, or by any number of different authors. They even care very little for the question as to how much of the gospels is legendary, and what modifications our views as to the earlier as well as to the later life of Jesus must undergo because of such legendary material in the records. But they are intensely interested in the reality of the spirit and in the possibility of a free, real and saving communion between the spirit of God and that of man. That is, such men question the very foundation upon which all religion rests. Now what help may the minister bring to men

of this type? I answer unhesitatingly not any until he himself is certain of his ground. He of course knows that spiritual things now as of old are spiritually discerned. Therefore while history and psychology, these two apparently more so than heretofore, and philosophy now as always, have their place in the study and development of religion they after all are not the instruments with which one may completely accomplish the task of explaining the phenomena of religion. And it will be to the credit of the religious leader if he frankly admits that he has no knowledge of spiritual facts in the sense in which men speak of scientific knowledge. But on the other hand the minister fails well nigh completely who does not take a decided stand in behalf of such facts. For as spiritual facts may be known he does know them and is therefore as positive of them as one can be of any facts definitely known to exist. He is God's representative; the prophet of the Lord unto the people of this age. He needs to speak as one having authority.

There may be agnostics. But their sphere is not the Christian pulpit. The Unscrutable very likely does not reveal himself in a sufficiently clear manner to any one to enable him to bear a definite and helpful message to men. The Christian minister has no right to speak thus, for example, to his flock. *I come to you in the name of God, if there be a God. This is his message if there really be a God and if I do not misinterpret the same.* No, he needs to be as certain of God and *His message unto man, and as sure that he is commissioned of Him to deliver the message he carries in his mind and heart as were the prophets of old.* Yet in the sense in which men know facts in the chemical laboratory the preacher does not know them. I do not wish to leave the impression that I claim that the minister may not have skeptical moods at times. It is difficult to understand how one who does real thinking can from first to last steer clear of such gloomy periods. But such seasons must be the exception and should by no means be the rule. And it goes without saying that he ought not to take his doubts with him into the pulpit and permit his people to

look upon their nakedness and hideousness. They have doubts enough of their own. Furthermore he owes it to himself and his people, if after due time he cannot dissipate or dispel his doubts as to the essential verities, to resign and leave the ministry. Skepticism exists, but the Christian pulpit was created, not for the dissemination of skepticism, but for the spread of the gospel of our Lord. The minister has a definite task at this time as over against agnosticism and open infidelity. He is to be certain of the ground whereupon he stands in the only sense in which he may be, and then proclaim and keep on proclaiming the gospel of God's fatherhood and love for all the children of men.

It seems to me there is no need of arguing the interest that the live minister takes in the great epoch-making thought-movements in the sphere of religion and theology. How can he possibly escape, for example, the study of Ritchlianism, pragmatism and the religionsgeschichtliche method of today? Not that an interest in their productions obliges him to approve of all the deductions on the part of the leading theological writers. Not even of only a part of them. But the founders of these several isms deal with matters that touch him vitally and therefore he wants to study them and in fact cannot refrain from being deeply interested in them. He is a religious teacher and leader among at least a small company of God's people, and most assuredly they have a right to look to him to keep himself informed with reference to matters that belong to what is distinctly his province. This is axiomatic. It is commonplace. So are facts that occasionally are overlooked. Are there not men in the active ministry today, and they not by any means men who all of them entered the profession thirty or more years ago, who have hardly even as much as a bowing acquaintance with the great isms that sway the theological world at the beginning of the twentieth century? Such men preach and pray after a fashion. But their voice sounds strange to thinking men who consciously or unconsciously have imbibed the spirit of the present time.

The minister needs to study the works of the giant minds of our age in addition to those of former days. Contact with such minds will stimulate him to fresh thought and will guarantee to him a power that is very essential to one who would lead men in the realm of spiritual things. He however does not study the works of men of this character in order merely to become familiar with the so-called new in theology as contrasted with the old. He is not interested in the new as such any more than he is interested in the old as such. What he seeks primarily is the truth of God. Wernle says: "Gott ist aber weder mit dem Altem, noch mit dem Neuem, sondern mit der Wahrheit, und derjenige Forscher dient Ihm, der ohne Menschenfurcht und Menschenglauben allein der Wahrheit die Ehre geben will."

Yet there is some danger that one who takes up the theological works of today may be carried away by the new to the extent that he will minimize what is old and to a degree likewise true. There is however a counter movement. Contact with men and women who wrestle with the problems of life as these come to view day by day will counteract to some extent such influences. For example, sometimes when groping his way through the philosophy of prayer the minister begins to wonder how much is left? Why men after all ought to pray? But just then he is confronted by a problem in his own life, or that of the congregation, and before he is aware of it—before he has really had time to lay his theories aside in an orderly manner—he discovers himself on his knees praying as if all depended on prayer.

In like manner in the hour of sorrow when called upon to bring comfort to wounded hearts, while his conclusions reached in the study appear to him impregnable in theory he very often, though no doubt from habit, turns to the truths that have been tried for ages upon ages and learns that they still meet the wants of those who seek comfort. Thus present-day experiences are among the means that bring about mitigations of our theology.

I trust, we are reminded that the ministry of today as that of yesterday has its task—a task that is never finished. He who sees this most clearly and in his own way works hard to do his part, be that part never so small, may not be appreciated. Such has frequently been the case in the past. But it is undoubtedly the duty of the laborer in this field, as it is that of laborers in other fields, to attend to what he knows to be his God-assigned task, and then leave results with him who has in mind a perfect whole, and who in some way will bring together the many men-made parts that we oftentimes call very imperfect and produce out of them a unit that He deems worth while—and He knows.

FREEMANSBURG, PA.

III.

THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

THEODORE F. HERMAN.

The Reformed Church is known as an educational church. From the beginning of our history we have sought to propagate the Christian religion by an educational method. Our main reliance has been upon intelligent instruction, rather than upon emotional revivals. For three hundred and fifty years the Heidelberg Catechism has been our text-book in religious education. We have taught its doctrines in catechetical classes, and we have preached them from our pulpits. And in this anniversary year, which commemorates the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism, three hundred and fifty years ago, we offer no apologies for the Reformed Church, neither for her educational method, nor for her catechetical manual of instruction. The one was right and sound in principle. It is being adopted generally in our time. And the other, our historical catechism, was the flower and fruit of the Reformation age. Its defects, in form and matter, are shared by all other contemporaneous catechisms, but none possesses so many distinctive evangelical merits.

And yet, while we are far from the apologetic mood in this anniversary year, we feel that the eulogistic mood is equally inadequate and inappropriate. We do not offer apologies for our past, but neither are we content with the present. A nobler and more serious mood than either carping criticism or complacent satisfaction is upon us as a Church, the magnificent mood of St. Paul, who said: "Brethren, I count not myself yet to have apprehended: but one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the

high calling of God in Jesus Christ." Let those glory in the past, and rest content with the victories and achievements of bygone days, whose work is done. Let that be the privilege of old age in the Indian Summer of life. But we, as a Church, have not yet run our race, nor finished our course. Our work for God has scarcely begun. And that mood is thrust upon us by the logic of events. It is not the idle musing of a few teachers, who live in their cloistral retreats far from the madding crowd. It is the temper that expresses the noblest religious yearning, and the deepest Christian aspiration of our age; the yearning to promote the kingdom of God upon earth and the aspiration to make the Christian religion a vital force, the great constructive force in our modern life.

And thus it has come to pass that in this anniversary year two dominant notes have resounded throughout the Reformed Church, the one appreciative and the other constructive. We have been exhorted by voice and pen to appreciate our historical heritage, and we have also been challenged to appraise our present need of religious education, and to meet that imperative need by reconstructing and adapting our theological and pedagogical heritage. These two notes belong together, and they should be intoned jointly by those who wish to remain loyal to the historical method of the Reformed Church for propagating the Christian religion. This may be disputed by theological standpatters, "who have stopped and can't start"; or it may be denied by theological insurgents, "who have started and can't stop." But it will be granted by the large and ever increasing number of sane progressives, who are neither rooted immovably in the past, nor running away from it blindly. They will appreciate our noble, historical heritage, but they will also seek to give value and power to the rich treasure inherited from the Reformers by coining it into current gold and silver.

We have a certain type of liberalism today that looks with disdain upon the old creeds and catechisms. Its champions speak with pride of modernism, and with deprecation of

mediaevalism, especially of mediaeval theology. But that attitude is both pseudo-scientific and pseudo-religious. It betrays not only a profound lack of insight into the historical genesis or ancient forms and symbols of faith, but, what is more grave, it manifests a lack of appreciation of the genuine religious experience which underlies and permeates every creed and catechism of the past. The former is a mental defect, but the latter is a moral weakness. These theologies, and creeds, and catechisms of past ages are not conglomerates of superstition, not idle speculations that originated in the minds of a few men. One and all, they were born of experience. They were forged in the furnace of eager, earnest life. They registered the convictions by which men lived, and for which they gladly died. They may record these profound convictions in language that has become unintelligible or unacceptable to us. Nevertheless, they must not be dismissed contemptuously as antiquated relics of a superstitious age.

Consider, for instance, the two great principles of the Reformation, justification by faith and the normative authority of the Scriptures, which in some form or other were wrought into all the creeds and catechisms of that period. Why did Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin make salvation by faith, through the grace of God, the very cornerstone of their confessions? Why does the Heidelberg Catechism devote its second part to the exposition of that doctrine? That man must be ignorant of history and of the heart of mankind who does not know that this great Reformation doctrine records the vital religious experience of that age. Luther had sought salvation in the cell of his monastery and in Rome. He had sought to earn forgiveness by penance and by works, but all his efforts at self-help were in vain. They led but to deeper self-condemnation and distrust. Then, one day, Paul showed him the way to peace. He saw that the only way to find forgiveness and peace was to abandon all hope and effort at self-righteousness and trust in God's eternal love revealed in Jesus Christ. And it was this profound and genuine religious experience of Luther, shared

by thousands like him, that led to the formulation and acceptance of the material principle of the Reformation. We read their confessions, and we discern that the form in which they expressed that great faith of the sixteenth century, and the philosophy by which they explained it, are no longer adequate to the Christian consciousness of today. Beneath the incidental form, which grew out of the thought and culture of the age, lies the eternal fact, that salvation is by the grace of God, and that men are saved only by faith in that marvellous grace. We do not accept their theory of the atonement, but we do share their faith that through Jesus Christ men may experience the forgiveness of sin. As theologians we may dissent from the theologians of the sixteenth century. But as Christians we know ourselves to be at one with them in our conviction that salvation is by faith.

Or consider the other great principle of the Reformation, which made the Bible the only source of authority for faith. Again we find this doctrine imbedded in every creed and criticism of that era. But why did men elevate this book to such a place of exclusive normative authority for Christian faith? Why did all the churches of the Reformation accept the doctrine of verbal and plenary inspiration? Was it because the Bible itself claimed that authority or because ecclesiastical assemblies passed decrees which pronounced it inerrant and infallible, dictated by the Holy Ghost himself? Again, I say, that man must be blind to history and ignorant of humanity who does not know the true answer. It was the rediscovery of this Holy Book that showed the men of the Reformation times the way to God, in whom they found salvation and peace. It became to them the Book of Books, not by any ecclesiastical decree or theological doctrine, but by a profound religious experience. It was the fountain to which they turned with parched hearts from the cisterns of scholasticism, and in which their souls found the water of life. It flashed light upon the dark mystery of sin. It poured love into consciences stricken with guilt. It arched the dark tomb

with radiant promises and assurances of immortal life. And it was this sacred experience that led to the doctrine of the exclusive and normative authority of the Scriptures. We read the confessions glowing with this noble faith in the Bible, and, again, we know that the form in which it is expressed belongs to the sixteenth century. We can no longer use their language, nor accept their interpretation of the authority of the Bible. But the fact is as true for us as it was for them. The Bible is the Book of Books. As the record of God's self-disclosure, beginning in primeval darkness, continuing through the ages, and culminating in Jesus Christ, it possesses supreme authority for Christian faith.

And what is true of these great principles of the Reformation is likewise true of every Christian doctrine of the past. They enshrine profound convictions, born of genuine religious experience, in forms and formulas that grew out of their times. The incidental forms may lose their significance and pass away, but the convictions which form their Christian content abide. And these abiding convictions form the living bond between past and present. Their mutual recognition and appreciation is the common ground on which conservative and progressive Christian thinkers may meet.

But we are also familiar with a certain type of conservatism today that constitutes as real and as great a menace to the Christian religion as radical liberalism. Its champions speak of the faith once delivered to the saints as of a quantitative deposit of doctrines, that must be kept intact, and passed on from age to age, without addition, subtraction, or mutilation. They are forever reminding men that in theology the new is not true, and the true, not new. If liberalism needs to be taught a sincere appreciation of the noble heritage of the past, this immovable traditionalism has still more to learn, not only of the past but also of the present. It needs to learn that the Christian religion is not primarily a series of doctrines, which must be taught and believed, but a life of filial communion with God. This life will precipitate doctrines, even as it will

become incarnate in forms of worship, in ecclesiastical organizations, and in ethical programs. But its essence is spiritual and not intellectual, political, or moral. And this spiritual life is the constitutive element in the Christian religion, and its only constant factor. Everything else is variable.

These theological standpatters will necessarily regard all our modern efforts at reconstruction as destructive. But even as the conservative Christians of today have a right to expect an appreciation of the forms of faith, which are precious to them, from those who no longer accept them as adequate, so, it would seem, the progressive Christians of our times have an equal right to expect, if not appreciation, at least an intelligent estimate of their efforts and a fair presentation of their sacred convictions. Their attempts to restate the abiding Christian convictions and to reconstruct our Christian theologies may be tentative and sophomoric, but they are not destructive of faith nor subversive of the Christian religion.

In this spirit this article on the *Essential Elements in Religious Education* is conceived and written. It claims to be neither radical nor traditional. And its primary aim is to point out the common ground on which men of conservative and of progressive tendencies may stand shoulder to shoulder in the religious education of our youth.

The topic "Religious Education" is large, and as complex as it is large. Henry F. Cope, the General Secretary of the Religious Education Association, in a recent address said: "It will scarcely be disputed, that ten years ago, the phrase signified, except to a few thoughtful leaders, formal instruction in the categories of religious knowledge. It meant systematic impartation of information regarding the Bible, religious history, and doctrine. Its range of ordinary activity was confined to Churches and Sunday Schools and other distinctively religious institutions. It was not education, but instruction; it was not necessarily 'religious' although it dealt with the history, literature, and philosophy of religion. It was concerned primarily with methods of arranging information into

suitable packages for storage in youthful minds." Thus, only a decade ago there was practical unanimity and uniformity in the essence of religious education, while today there seems to be no agreement at all as to the means, the method, and the content of religious education.

But, to begin with, there can be no disagreement, it would seem, as to the *aim* of religious education. Its sole aim must be the development of Christlike personalities. Its curriculum must give us "a program of life development that is religious in aim, in method, and in its conception of the person being educated." The aim of all modern education is the making of men. In the past, our educational policy has been controlled largely by two ideals, the one English and the other German. The aim of English education was culture, and the aim of German education was scholarship. But we have come to realize that the true aim of education is neither the making of gentlemen, nor the making of schoolmen, but the making of men. Manhood, not mere culture nor scholarship, is the aim of education. Thus the aim of religious education is the making of Christlike men. Whatever the means and the method of religious education may come to be, if it is Christian, it must propagate the religion of Jesus Christ by producing Christlike persons.

What, then, are our educational assets, and what our educational liabilities? What have we got, as a Christian Church, to make men Christlike? What ought we to do, as a Christian denomination, to realize our supreme aim?

Our educational assets are not new. We are living in an age of educational novelties and specialties. In our colleges, we have cultural and technical courses, fixed courses and electives, things old and things new. Not so in the Church. Our assets are old. They date back to Christ. They are the things which are distinctive and characteristic of the Christian religion. The first is a doctrine; the second, an experience; and the last, a duty. And these three originated with Jesus Christ. It is he who gave mankind a new doctrine,

who opened the way to a new experience, and who set a new task. And so the Church, from the beginning, has called him prophet, priest, and king. As a prophet, he revealed the truth of God; as a priest, he manifested God's power for the salvation of the world; and as a king, he declared His eternal purpose.

And here lies the significance of the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. It was the protest of Christian men against that stupendous Church, which Luther called the anti-Christ, and which all the Reformers agreed had dethroned Jesus as the prophet, priest and king of mankind. It was a heroic effort to return to Jesus Christ and find in him, in his Gospel and life, the truth, the power, and the purpose of God for the salvation of the world. And today we start, precisely where they started, with the eternal Gospel of Jesus Christ. We go with them the full length of their journey, from Romanism back through the ages, to the truth as it was in Jesus Christ. But we cannot, dare not, stop where they stopped four hundred years ago. It is they, the great Reformers themselves, who make it so absolutely impossible for us today to stop, and rest content in the sixteenth century. For four hundred years the mighty impulses have been at work which they set in motion. Christ has reigned and his Gospel has been studied and practised. He has been humanity's prophet, the truth teller whom God sent in the fullness of time. He has been humanity's priest, the sin bearer who alone has manifested the divine power, by which men are saved. He has been humanity's king, the sovereign who slowly, but surely, is establishing his supremacy over all the kingdoms of this world. The Holy Spirit of God has not been inoperative since he revealed mighty truths to the Reformers, and wrought great deeds through them. He has continued to take the things of Christ and show them unto us. We believe, with Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, that in Jesus Christ the truth, the power, and the purpose of God are manifestd for the salvation of the world. But, we say it reverently and firmly, we believe that today we

know more of the essence of that truth, understand better the meaning of that power, and see more clearly the majestic sweep of that divine purpose. Hence, when we survey our educational assets, the things which God has given us, as a Church, for the making of Christlike personalities, we say that our one incomparable asset is Jesus Christ himself, that mighty, mysterious, creative personality, who, nineteen centuries ago, in little Palestine, founded the Christian religion. Not the confessional or catechetical writings of past ages, not even the New Testament itself, but Jesus Christ, of whom the New Testament bears record, and whose significance the confessions and catechisms of the Church seek to interpret. This Jesus, as the prophet, the priest, and the king of humanity, is our one educational asset. What does that mean?

Jesus is our prophet. Nicodemus was right, when he said: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God." Jesus is the truth teller of the ages, the greatest teacher mankind has known. He has given us a doctrine which forms part of our educational assets. Now the truth which Jesus taught was spiritual truth. He did not teach mathematics, science or history, nor even theology. In all these things Jesus was a child of his age; in spite of his divinity, a child of the first century, who believed what other men believed, and who taught what others had taught him. But what he knew of God, and man, and of their relations; of man's sin and salvation; of the soul, its ground and its goal, that no school and no man had taught him. That was the fruit of his personal fellowship with the Father. And so the Master went up and down through Palestine teaching of God the Father and of man, His child, preaching the glorious news that though men were sinners they were yet precious to God; though they were living in rebellion and dreary alienation, yet God was seeking to win their hearts and wills with all the measureless love and patience of His divine heart. And the common people heard him gladly. They said, "He speaks with authority and power." They called his truth the Gospel, a glad tidings. They felt

that this Jesus laid bare the heart of God, and that he disclosed the great spiritual realities of the universe, as they had never been disclosed before.

And this truth which Jesus taught is one of our educational assets. It is not identical with any theological system that men have wrought out; nor is it found, in its fullness, in any creed of Christendom, nor in any confession or catechism of Protestantism. Precious and significant as these are, one and all, they are only the efforts of men to spell out in lisping accents and with stammering tongues the truth as it was in Christ Jesus. And though we believe reverently that God has given us a deeper insight into these truths than any previous age possessed, we are equally sure that many future generations of earnest and devout Christian men must become disciples of Jesus before the world will understand the full glory of God as it was revealed in the teachings of Jesus Christ.

Jesus is also our priest. We say with Nicodemus, that he is a teacher. But we also say, with the whole of the New Testament, that "His name is Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sin." As he gave us new truth, so likewise Jesus has given us a new experience. He brought men to God. He not only showed men the Father. He also showed them the way to the Father; a new and living way into the Holy of Holies, where sinners found acceptance, forgiveness and peace. It was not the way of the lawgiver of former times, who had said: "Keep the commandments and thou shalt live." Men knew that way. They had trodden it through the ages, and it had not led them into peace. They were treading it in the days of Jesus with weary feet, and with hearts and consciences burdened with the sense of failure and guilt. Nor was it the way of the priest of former times, who had said: "Offer sacrifices to God, peace offerings, and burnt offerings that you may satisfy His justice and appease His wrath." Men knew that way. The highway of history was *marked with sanctuaries and smoking altars where priests performed ceremonies, and where high priests made atonement for the sins of the people.*

But that way had not led to peace. Men who had trodden it had the spirit of slaves, they worshipped God in fear and trembling. Jesus showed men a new way to God. Come home, he said, to your Father in heaven. Go to Him in the filial spirit, and cry abba, Father. Leave behind you your meritorious works, and your sacrificial offerings, and go to Him in penitence. Trust God, and surrender to Him, and you shall live.

And, mark it well, it was not so much his teaching, as his life that opened this new way to the Father. Others before Jesus had shown men the Father, but they had never brought men to God. But in Jesus Christ the Father came to earth. God in Christ dwelt among men. Men began to realize that even as Christ was Godlike, so God was Christlike. As Christ received sinners and ate with them; as Christ looked with infinite compassion upon sinners and sacrificed himself for them, the just for the unjust, so the Christlike God stood ready to receive sinners that said in the spirit of penitence and trust, "I will arise and go unto my Father." There is deep spiritual insight, and eternal truth, in the saying of Peter: "Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God." It was not primarily his teachings, but his life, that had redemptive power. It was his divine life of service and sacrifice for sinners that brought men to God. In him men found a new way to the Father.

And thus Jesus Christ has become humanity's high priest. Beginning in his life, and continuing through all the subsequent ages, men have entered into the presence of God with boldness by the new and living way. They have come to God in the name of Jesus Christ. In the place of all the external and legal devices for securing the divine favor, they have put the spiritual principles which he revealed in his life and work. They have come in childlike penitence and trust and they have found in God a gracious and forgiving Father. And this is the specific and distinctive Christian experience of salvation: to come to God, not with meritorious works, not with external

sacrifices, but in penitence and trust; to surrender to the love of God revealed in Christ, and to let this divine love save one from the guilt and power of sin.

And this new experience of salvation, which Jesus Christ brought into the world, is the second of our educational assets. All the Christian ages have magnified it and so do we. One vast anthem resounds through the centuries praising God for His gracious love manifested in Christ, whereby he saves men from their sins. It is intoned by Paul and John; it is taken up by Origen and Augustine; it swells to an exultant pæan of victory when the Reformers sound it forth anew. And we of today know of no other song to take its place. We stand humbly and gratefully with the apostles and saints, and confess that we are saved by the grace of God revealed in Jesus Christ. And yet, though we sing the old song of salvation, we sing it with new lips, for we believe that this new experience of salvation by the power of God's love is vastly deeper and richer than any explanation or interpretation of it, which has been given by men. I believe with all my heart in the forgiveness of sins, but not in the theory of the atonement taught by the Reformers; I believe thoroughly in regeneration, but not in the explanation made of it in the past; I believe it is God who saves men, God who justifies and sanctifies men, but I do not believe that He performs these gracious acts for the reasons assigned in our Heidelberg Catechism. Even as the Spirit of God, working through the ages, has given us a deeper insight into the truth which Jesus taught, so, I believe, the same Spirit has given us a truer apprehension of the salvation which Jesus wrought.

Jesus is also our King. Not only the prophet who has revealed the truth to us; not only the great high priest who has brought us to God; but also humanity's king who has proclaimed the eternal purpose of the Father. And the Master himself tells us what this divine purpose is. Beginning his ministry with the proclamation of the kingdom of God, he devoted his life to the establishment of this kingdom in the

hearts of men. He said that, like a leaven, this kingdom should permeate the life of mankind in all its relations, and that, like a mustard seed, it should extend and fill all the spheres of the life of the world. And this kingdom was a spiritual kingdom. It was the rule of God in the hearts of men. It consisted of those who accepted God as their Father and men as their brethren and who lived their life in this filial and fraternal spirit.

Calvin was right when he called God a mighty king of sovereign power. But he was wrong when he taught that it was the purpose of this omnipotent King to save a certain number of elect persons out of the whole human race to show His mercy, and to condemn all the rest of mankind to satisfy His justice. He misinterpreted the purposes of the King. He failed to understand that this Almighty King was not a capricious tyrant, but a Father. Only the Son knew the Father and it is he who has told us that it is not His purpose to select and save a few men, but to bring all mankind under the sway of His benign spirit. This eternal purpose of God, which Jesus proclaimed, is our third educational asset.

And thus, when we appraise our educational assets, the means which we possess to produce Christlike personalities, we find that they center in Christ. He is our one asset, our prophet, priest and king; the truth-teller, the saviour, and the leader of our race. It is the truth which he reveals, the experience into which he leads, and the duty which he proclaims, which constitute our educational assets.

What then ought we to do to make men Christlike; what are our educational liabilities; what is the task that confronts us in religious education? The answer is obvious. If I have given a correct statement of our educational assets, then it follows inevitably that in order to realize the supreme aim of religious education we must show men the Father, that they may believe in Him; we must bring men to God, that they may experience salvation; we must proclaim His purpose that they

may learn to do His will. However difficult it may be for us in this age to translate this educational theory into practice, to devise ways and means of imparting this religious education to our youth, the theory at least is clear, and it is with that I am here concerned. We must help men to understand the truth, to trust the power, and to share the will of God.

God has laid a prophetic task upon us. As a Church, we must teach and preach the truth which Jesus Christ has given us. I do not hesitate to say that the proclamation of the truth is the most imperative need of our times and the supreme educational task of the Church. For there lies our fatal weakness. Our age does not know God and man and their relation as Jesus knew them. We have lost our grip on the eternal realities, which he laid bare. There are those among us who say: "there is no truth, no revelation, no certain knowledge concerning these eternal things, concerning God and man, and the soul. All is fancy, not fact; speculation, but not revelation." And so they proclaim their melancholy message of doubt and denial to our distracted age. There are others who say: "Jesus is only one of many prophets. There were truth tellers before him; there have been others after him." So we have our Dowies, and Eddies and Sanfords, our imported Saviours from India and Persia, who delude and deceive men with their philosophies. There are still others who tell us that men care nothing for the truth which Jesus has revealed. They say our age is tired of philosophies and impatient of theologies. They claim that we want deeds not creeds. There are teachers, and preachers even, who echo this cry and seek to minister to our age by organizing crusades, by leading reform movements, and by becoming advocates of socialistic programs. But truth and life, creed and deed, are joined together by God and can never be safely separated. If we want men to live a Christlike life, if we want them to live here on earth as the sons of God and as the children of their heavenly Father, then we must show them the Father, and teach them to know and to understand what our great prophet has taught us concerning

the things of the spirit. To expect Christlike deeds without a Christian creed, is as foolish and futile as to expect to reap fruit without planting roots.

Therefore, I repeat, what our age needs most is a knowledge of the living God and of the great religious truths, which Jesus Christ lived and taught. And the supreme educational function of the Church is her prophetic task to preach and teach that truth. The most pathetic passage in the Old Testament is the lament of Job, "Oh that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat! Behold, I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the left hand, when he doth work, I cannot behold him: He hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him" (Job XXIII: 3, 8-9). That is the sob of a human heart in the midst of the perplexities of life. That is man's cry for the living God. And that cry is loud today. Men have gone forward into business, but God was not there. They have plunged back into pleasure, but God was not there. They have sought Him with microscope and telescope, but God hideth Himself from the mind of man. And so mankind cries today with Job, "Oh! that I knew where I might find him."

That is Eucken's message to our age. That great modern prophet lays bare our deficiencies, and points to the only adequate remedy. He tells us that we are rich at the circumference of life, but abjectly poor at its center; that we abound in possessions, but are destitute of profound spiritual convictions. And, therefore, in spite of our marvellous civilization, a paralyzing doubt saps the vitality of our age. There is no pervading sense of confidence and security as to the meaning of life, and as to its value. And the one remedy which Eucken commends to mankind with so much earnestness of conviction is the recognition of the supreme spiritual realities which alone give life its meaning and value, and the vital response of the individual to the nature and requirements of the spiritual life. That is the philosopher's way of interpreting the pressing

demand of our age. Translated into religious language it means: show men the Father and it sufficeth them.

Let the church arise in her strength and gird herself for the prophetic task of showing men the Father. We must do for our age what the Reformers did for theirs. We must set forth the truth which Jesus Christ has taught us in new catechisms and manuals for the instruction of our youth. It must be evident to thoughtful observers of our times that there are today two new theology movements, or, rather, two phases of the one great movement. The one is patiently constructive, and the other blatantly assertive. The one conducts careful historical investigations. It gives us critical analyses of doctrines, and tentative restatements. It aims at a gradual reinterpretation of our Christian religion in forms of modern knowledge and thought. The other flourishes in popular magazines and in sensational pulpits. It aims to build a new Temple of Faith for humanity, not indeed, without the clamor of hammer or ax or any tool of iron, but in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. And its extravagant assertions and startling predictions throw men into confusion, and tend to discredit the cause which it professes to serve. But these spasmodic theologians and dogmatic scientists, whose zeal is greater than their light, are only the circling eddies on the broad stream of modern theology that is silently flowing onward in a deep bed and with life-giving waters. The only uncertain factor in its onward flow is time. It cannot be stemmed, for it wells up irresistibly from the deep fountain of truth. But men may divert its course and impede its flow by continuing to build walls of tradition and bulwarks of apologetics around their congregations and denominations. They are only postponing the day when the Church shall convince the world that in the Gospel of Christ she possesses the treasure of the wisdom of God, and, in this wisdom, the most rational, the most satisfactory solution of the riddles of the universe.

God has also laid a priestly task upon us. Our priestly task in religious education is to give men the Christian experi-

ence of salvation from sin, which Jesus Christ has given us as our great high priest; to lead men to the Father by the new and living way, which Jesus has opened to us, that they may come to God, trust the power of God's love, surrender to Him, and be saved from their sin. Do we fully understand the meaning and the magnitude of this priestly task?

In Jesus' time, the world, roughly speaking, consisted of Greeks, Romans and Jews. The Greeks believed in philosophy. They taught that men are saved by education. "Virtue," said their great teacher, Socrates, "is knowledge." The Romans believed in force. They held that men are saved by legislation, by laws backed by strong military authority. And the Jews believed in morality. They taught that salvation must be won by good works. Heaven, according to their faith, was the reward of the law keepers, and hell the punishment of the law breakers. Then Jesus came and preached salvation by the love of God, a divine love, given freely to the least and the lowest among men, a love proffered to publicans and sinners, a love that would lift men and cleanse them from the guilt of sin and free them from its power. "Come to God," said Jesus to sinful humanity. "Come in penitence and trust, surrender your hearts and wills to the Father, and He will save you and give you the abundant life." Is it any wonder, then, that such a proclamation was foolishness to the Greeks, weakness to the Romans, and a stumbling block to the Jews.

The world has not changed much since Jesus' day. Greeks, Romans, and Jews are still with us, men who expect to save mankind from their sin by education, and legislation, or moral culture. We are familiar with them. We know their aims, and we sympathize with many of their aspirations. And yet, as Christians, we say to them, one and all: You are wrong, and doomed to certain failure. Greece failed; and so did Rome, and Judaism. You also must fail. It is not education, not legislation, nor moral culture will save the world from its sin and heal its sorrows. There is only one power can do that, the power of God's love. And it is only when men come to

God by the new and living way which Christ has shown them, and find in Him their gracious Father, that they experience salvation.

And today, as of old, this Gospel is foolishness and weakness and a stumbling block to the masses of mankind. And how shall we convince a skeptical, scoffing world of our claim? How shall we perform our priestly task and lead men to God? How shall we induce men to surrender to God's love in penitence and trust? There is only one answer to this question: *THAT* faith cannot be taught, it must be caught! Caught, by those who doubt or deny it, from those who preach and practise it. If our age needs prophets, it also needs priests. If our times call for manuals of truth, they call even louder for men who are priests, as Christ was a high priest,—men who embody and exemplify in their daily lives the power of God's love for our salvation. Thus salvation came to men. The gift of God's love was Jesus Christ; not a book, but a life; not a message but a messenger; a man who served, suffered and sacrificed himself that he might bring men to God. And thus salvation has continued to come to men through the ages. The real victories of the Church have not been won by her politics or liturgies, by her theologies or her philosophies, but by the men who have borne witness to Jesus by walking in his steps. And thus only will salvation come to our age. Give us Christlike men in pulpit and pew, Christlike teachers and parents in school and home; give us personalities who live and work in the spirit of the Master, who love men as Christ loved them, who are willing to serve and sacrifice and suffer as Christ did, in order to save men from sin! Give us men who know that the bottom fact of this universe, its inmost being, is not matter but spirit, not mind but heart, not law but love! Give us men who have experienced this redeeming love personally, and through whom it flows out in a gracious ministry of service and sacrifice! Give us such men, and we will solve the problem of religious education. The world will come to believe in Jesus' truth when it sees it practised. And men will trust

and try Jesus' way of salvation, when they see it exemplified in the lives of those who profess it. Life will beget life and spirit will kindle spirit. Such living creeds, such vital catechisms will be read and understood and believed by all men everywhere.

Finally, God has laid a kingly task upon us. That task consists in getting men to share the divine purpose. Religious education, as viewed in this article, will give truth to men; it will impart life to mankind; and it will give that life its task. And that task will be the establishment of the kingdom of God. When Jesus Christ launched this kingdom of God, nineteen centuries ago, it seemed like a magnificent dream. In an age which knew nothing of empires, save those founded by force and cemented with blood, our Lord proclaimed that it was the purpose of God to found a universal empire of love, in which filial trust of God and fraternal love of man should reign supreme. But what has become of it during these ages? Has the dream been fulfilled or has it been forgotten? "It was indeed a dream," we hear men say, "the beautiful fancy of a pure man, but nothing has come of it." Like all dreams, it has dissolved into nothingness. The world today is what it has always been. Beneath the thin veneer of our so-called Christian civilization are the greed and lust, the cruelty and selfishness of ancient paganism. And alas! there is much in the life of Christendom to lend force to such statements. Nevertheless, the kingdom of God is not an iridescent dream. Rather, let us say, it was a heavenly vision too high and holy for the comprehension of men. In proclaiming it, Jesus spoke the language of heaven, and it has taken his Church ages to spell out his message, letter by letter, and syllable by syllable. The Church may have been slow of heart and dull of understanding to comprehend the Gospel of the kingdom in all its fullness, but never has she doubted or denied it. Throughout all the former ages of her history she has attempted to be faithful to the divine purpose of redemption which Jesus proclaimed.

But now these former ages are past. A new time is upon us, a new fulness of time. As never before we understand God's gracious purpose. The same Spirit who has given us a deeper insight into the truth which Jesus taught, and a truer apprehension of the salvation which he wrought, has also given us a nobler conception of the divine purpose which he proclaimed. Today we realize that God is at work here and now to extend His rule upon earth through Christ, and that He will not rest from His labor until the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of Christ, until His will is done on earth as it is in heaven. Formerly it was said: Watch and pray until the Lord comes to establish his kingdom! But now we know that he is here. He has already come. He is present in the hearts of men and mightily at work in society. Formerly it was said: Come into the Church, the ark of the New Testament, and be saved from the corrupt and doomed world! But now we challenge those who are in the Church, to go out and save the world from its corruption. Formerly it was said: Repent and believe and you shall go to heaven when you die! But now we say: Repent and believe and God will save you from your sins here and now, and give you a foretaste of heaven upon earth.

"Heaven upon earth!" You hear that cry on every side. It is one of the insistent demands of our age. It resounds through the whole world. Give us heaven here and now! We hear it in broken accents from the submerged classes and in hoarse and frenzied shouts from the lips of revolutionaries. We hear it in serious lay sermons in many a marketplace. Silence this great cry we could not if we would. It grows ever louder. And silence it I would not though I could. For I believe that it is an echo of Jesus' Gospel of the kingdom. I believe that these prophets of a new social order speak the language of Jesus Christ, albeit they speak it in strange accents, and often in ignorance and confusion. They need above all things the coöperation of the Church, the sympathetic interpretation of their human longings for righteous-

ness, justice, and peace in the light of Jesus' Gospel of the kingdom. They need to know that we of the Church of Christ understand their aspirations for a new world order, in which all men shall live as brothers, and that to us this is not a Utopian dream, not an ungodly scheme, but the will of our Father in heaven.

And this is our kingly task: To get men who know God in Christ, and who have tasted and tested His infinite love in the forgiveness of sins, to share in His great redemptive purpose. To get men to help Jesus Christ win the victory over the sin and selfishness in this world. To regenerate the life of humanity in all its phases, and to bring it into harmony with the divine will. I call it our kingly task, for it was proclaimed by the kingliest of men, and it requires men who are kings, as Christ was a king: Triumphant men, lords of the spirit and masters of their soul, who seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and who give a subordinate place to all the harvests of fame, pleasure, and riches of the kingdoms of this world.

The duty of getting men to share God's redemptive purpose does not necessarily impose upon the Church the task of adopting definite programs of social reform. There is a great difference between teaching and preaching the principles of the kingdom of God, and between prescribing the precise methods by which they shall be embodied in the structure of society. The one task requires a prophet with spiritual insight and religious convictions, and the other, a statesman with political sagacity and practical experience—gifts and graces which are rarely found united in one personality. It behooves us to remember that we are blazing our way on paths untrodden by human feet. We can follow no precedents, and we can cite no examples of the past for our guidance and instruction in these matters. Yet we have the example of our Lord, who was a prophet, and not a social reformer. He proclaimed the ideals, he furnished the motives and convictions, and he trained disciples. Thus we are on safe ground in maintaining that the

proper task of the Church, like her Master's, is to inspire and not to direct. She must look with intelligent Christian sympathy on every attempt to incarnate Christian ideals in our social order; she must have a warm heart for all the genuine reform movements that challenge her to turn the pulpit into a platform for their advocacy. But her unique and supreme task is to proclaim the ideals of the kingdom and to train men and women who will espouse them at every cost of personal inconvenience and material sacrifice. Possibly, the day will come when, in addition to this inspiring function, the Church will be qualified and prepared to give men "manual training in altruism" (in the felicitous phrase of Shailer Mathews); when our Sunday Schools will require the practice of the lessons taught; when our policy in religious education will be brought into full accord with the modern axiom of pedagogy, that "we learn by doing." But that addition of experimentation to our present function of information and inspiration must needs come gradually and tentatively. It cannot safely be left to the individual pastor or to a single church, here and there. It must come through some collective body, such as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, whose united wisdom and combined endeavor will be required to direct the zeal, and to shape the policy of the awakened conscience of the Christian Church. Meanwhile, the unique task of the Church is great enough to tax all her energies, and holy enough to enlist all her wisdom and piety. She must inspire and train men who, as individuals or in collective groups, as citizens, employers, or employees, shall be able and willing to incarnate the ideals of the kingdom into corporate society. She must do this by preaching these ideals, by pointing to the person of her Lord, as the embodiment of the wisdom, the power, and the purpose of God, and, above all, by proclaiming the living God as the only adequate architect and builder of the Holy City of our aspirations.

We are planning noble forward movements along many lines during this anniversary year. And our own canvass and cam-

paign for definite Christian service, and for systematic Christian sacrifice, is but a part of a larger movement which is world-wide in extent and deeper far than our minds can fathom. Years ago Thomas Carlyle said "A splendor of God must get itself unfolded out of the heart of these industrial ages, else they will remain distressed, chaotic, and distracted, until they are annihilated." That, I believe, is happening now. God is getting deeper into the heart of mankind. He is pressing forward the conquest of this world. We see the whole earth in tumultuous commotion. We see the smoke of battle, and we hear the noise of conflict. Prophets of despair tell us that the end is nigh. But the prophets whom Jesus has taught know that out of this tumultuous distracted Today, God, through Christ, is ushering in the splendor of His Tomorrow, when His will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven. And the reserve army whom God is marching up to the conflict and the conquest are the youth of the Church. To enroll them as loyal and devoted disciples under the banner of Jesus Christ, we must give them a religious education that will really teach them the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, that will give them a personal experience of the power of God's love, and that will acquaint them with the gracious purpose of their Father, reaching back into eternity, bursting forth on Calvary, and gripping with its omnipotent love all the ages yet to be.

LANCASTER, PA.

IV.

THE FUNCTION OF THE COLLEGE IN THE MAKING OF A MAN.¹

H. H. APPLE.

It is my privilege to speak to you at this time when we open the doors of Franklin and Marshall College for the work of another year. We have happily joined with us the Theological Seminary which resumes upon this same day and, we may add, the Academy which assembles its students one week later. We form a group which embraces preparatory, college and university forms of education. What I have to say is of concern to each of these parts of a group and has a bearing on all phases of education, for in American life they are strongly linked together. What concerns one concerns all. A change in the form or nature of a college will effect quickly and radically the preparatory school on the one hand and the university on the other. Standing between these two the college in our country has attained a position of special importance. Upon her, I am convinced, rests a large responsibility for the welfare of our whole educational system, even from the elementary schools which look forward to it up to the highest university specialization, which forms an unbroken process to fit men for the activities of effective and useful service in life. It is significant that in spite of all the changes which have taken place in the outward form of courses of study in these various educational institutions and the many new branches which have been introduced to meet the demands and needs of a modern age the purpose of the college course has not changed. It is important that the aim shall be the same for the

¹ The address delivered at the opening of Franklin and Marshall College, September 11, 1913, by President H. H. Apple, D.D., LL.D.

future, for there is a distinctive and essential feature which dare not be lost in the training and discipline offered to young men in the life of a standard college. I shall refer therefore to the chief function of the college, which is the making of a man.

I may be permitted first to express appreciation of the pleasure which I have in greeting you on this opening day—marked as it is by happy reunions of old professors and students who have been reunited in our important work. Whatever may have been our experiences of a summer interim, tinged now with sadness and now with gladness, we are joined again in the happy privilege of new work. I extend at the same time a cordial and hearty welcome to new professors and new students who have come to enlarge our circle and we believe to enrich our service. We welcome you to an institution which is old in years, famed in usefulness and strengthened in equipment to meet the responsibility of education in a vigorous and progressive civilization. We cherish the noble and splendid heritage which has been bequeathed to us by the scholarly and cultured men who occupied chairs in this institution in the past and whose untiring labors continue to bless and inspire us. With keen consciousness of their remarkable achievements, adding luster to history and blessings to students, we shall strive, even with our recognized shortcomings, to emulate their zeal and faithfulness that both of us, faculty and students, may so perform our duties as to hand down in like manner to the future the high ideals and honored traditions which for the time being are intrusted to our hands. Together with other things which might readily be mentioned, we are encouraged in our efforts by the recent successful conclusion of the endowment movement which will place the College upon a firm financial foundation and increase our efficiency. The fact that we are, in comparison with many others, a small college is to our advantage. For, after all, a college is something more than its buildings and grounds, its endowment and its income. Its educational effectiveness is in its

men more than in these. Its traditions and good name, the atmosphere that pervades its halls, and the spirit that dominates all its activity, are largely to be reckoned with in any estimate of its efficiency and worth. One college may have millions to the good in comparison with another and its roster of students may sum up hundreds or even thousands more, and yet its real power, its capacity of influence on the life about it, and of the uplift of its environment, may be incomparably less than the institution of more modest showing in outward prosperity. It is conspicuous that in all our history, running through the one hundred twenty six years since the founding of the third oldest college in Pennsylvania, named after the greatest American of his day, Benjamin Franklin, and the seventy-seven years from the beginning of the classical institution whose patron saint was our scholarly jurist, John Marshall, and combined in a stream of life flowing from the union of these two, the first essential aim of Franklin and Marshall College has been to make men. And with the widened and strengthened curriculum today we justly lay claim to the same purpose and aim, to develop and mould personalities into such manhood as will contribute to noble and serviceable lives. And this is after all the biggest business there is. It is not simply the biggest business in the city, nor in the state but the biggest business in the world. Emerson directed attention to this when he said: "The greatest enterprise in the world for splendor, for extent, is the upbuilding of a man." And certainly creative passion can manifest itself in no higher way than in the manufacture of men whose business it is to express themselves completely in service to their neighbors. The greatness of railways and steamship lines, of factories and buildings of steel, of mines and farms, of schools and churches, of canals that connect the oceans and of irrigation projects which reclaim the deserts from the dominion of the sun, characteristics of material progress, cannot equal the manufacturing plant, if I may call it such, which produces for the world the most precious product in the universe, the bodies and brains

of men. Aristotle proclaimed the perfect life to be the fullest expression of self in service to society. Christ taught the same lesson, and his crucifixion is the most beautiful of all symbols, that the first great task is to build men. Assuredly the very foundation of an educational institution, if not the fullest scope, is to send out into life healthy, self-reliant, service-rendering men.

It must be admitted that at times many things have contributed to confuse this idea of education. The word has been given a variety of meanings according as there has been neglect of some of those elements that go to make up its content or undue emphasis of some in preference to others. A discussion of various methods devised for carrying out the process of education has often led wide of the mark. It is my purpose to mention a few things which contribute to the training and discipline of college education which is the due and harmonious development of all the latent faculties in a human being.

In that sense there is place in the curriculum for gymnastics, or if you please, athletics, to develop the material or bodily faculties of the student. The old saying of "*mens sana in corpore sano*," while glaringly defective as expressing a goal for education, was not wholly in error. The body may be the lowest part of personality but at the same time it deserves consideration in the development of the whole man; body, mind and soul. Walt Whitman thus praises the physical being:

"If anything is sacred, the human body is sacred,
And the glory and sweet of a man is the token of manhood
untainted;
And in man or woman a clean, strong-fibered body is more beautiful
than the most beautiful face."

The apostle Paul views it in the same sense when he says: "Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost." This matter of physical fitness must be a concern of the college and we need to emphasize the importance of physical development and increase physical efficiency.

A growing body demands two things, nourishing food and proper exercise. No matter how much nourishing food a man may eat, if he does not exercise properly he will die. Our muscles are developed only through eating nourishing food and taking proper exercise. The man who guides in these is every bit as holy as the man who preaches a sermon to feed our minds and souls.

The claims of hygiene are today finding increased recognition. The great enemy of every country is disease. We are shocked and stunned by the list of killed or injured because of the disregard for the simplest rules of physical safety. Every day hundreds of persons are dropping out of the ranks whose lives and usefulness might have been saved if more attention had been given to proper exercise and recreation. The problem is not too childish for consideration. Even the most simple exercise taken systematically changes a body beyond belief. There may not be great enlargement of muscles but the man becomes supple and upright, healthier and happier, less cross and less nervous. The body must not be made a source of shame but of pride. A college owes its students a full chance to learn healthy exercise and for daily indulgence in such. There are those inclined to think what a man is physically is due to heredity which we cannot change. But we dare not encourage the man who squanders his body and we cannot disregard the means of saving and strengthening it. To our interest in the conservation of natural resources we ought to add a far greater interest in the conservation of physical manhood.

I am free to confess my belief that the best form of physical training is found in games. Military exercise and gymnasium drill are good enough for the student who must be forced to it. These serve to strengthen the muscle and keep the system clean as well as to teach correct habits of carriage and graceful movement. But the game in all its varied forms not only appeals to a boy but by its character stimulates physical courage, individual initiative, concentration of energy, poise, judgment,

quick decision, normal exultation in victory and laudable temper in defeat.

There have been and are today evils in athletics. But there is no one today who is striving harder than the college student to correct these evils. Most of them, the chief evils as well as the smaller evils, are the product of crudity, inexperience, and immaturity. Too often the attitude of the college authorities toward college athletics has been an alternation of indifference, hostility and indulgence. Too often has it taken the form of issuing rules and regulations and too seldom has it involved participation in them. That would be the surest way to secure the fine traditions that make athletics one of the durable influences over youth. One of the reasons that athletics in England has been kept clean by fine traditions is due to the fact that to an extent not yet familiar in this country it is regarded as natural that the same man should be scholar and athlete. If in future years public life in America shall become cleaner, business life more honest, professional life more elevated, it will, in part at least, be due to the training in self control and idealism furnished by clean athletics in our colleges.

Of greater importance is the training of the mind and the development of mental power. The quality and quantity of this power depends upon the mental food and the mental exercise men take. Ideas are food. We eat them, we digest them, we assimilate them. The ideas we feed our mind are the ideas that express themselves in speech and action. Nourishing mental food and proper mental exercise develop the mental muscles, just as nourishing physical food and proper physical exercise develop the physical muscles. Education embraces not only the subject to be educated but also the various means by which the latent faculties are to be developed—science and art and literature; it embraces the imbibing of knowledge and those principles and that discipline by which the character is to be fashioned.

It is clear that merely to impart knowledge is not educa-

tion; neither is he the best educated man who knows most about things. Knowledge, it is true, must be imparted in the course of education—knowledge of facts, knowledge of laws and principles. This side cannot be minimized but it is of little value unless there is such training and discipline of the mind as to render it capable of wise service.

In this respect the college plays a unique part in American life. It forms men who can bring to their tasks an incomparable morale, a capacity that seems more than individual, a power touched with large ideals. The college is the seat of ideals. The liberal training which it seeks to impart takes no thought of any particular profession or business, but is meant to reflect in its few and simple disciplines the image of life and thought. Men are bred by it to no skill or craft or calling; the discipline to which they are subjected has a more general object. It is meant to prepare them for the whole of life rather than some particular part of it. The ideals which lie at its heart are the general ideals of conduct, of right living and right thinking, which make them aware of a world moralized by principle, a world not of interests but of ideals. Such impressions, such challenges to a man's spirit, such intimations of privilege and duty, are not and cannot be found in the work of professional schools.

In any teaching of the experience of the race the sciences have a necessary place. None would advocate the adoption of the unchanged classical course of fifty years ago. Some knowledge of science is a part of a liberal education and should be taught at least so far as to enable graduates to enter the best professional schools. But the age of the classics has not yet gone by. One of the classic tongues, Greek or Latin, is the one royal road to a knowledge of all that is finest in letters and art. The language of the Hellenes in beauty, accuracy and power is unequalled and Latin is essential to a complete mastery of our own native tongue. The college must emphasize to a greater degree the tried classical discipline rather than compete with technical schools. There is room in this

large country for institutions of every kind and there are still people who will give their children an old-fashioned education, that is, a discipline that has been tested, under teachers convinced of its merits.

The popular appraisal of education is commercial—measuring the value of a training by the income it returns, and if every man is to stand for himself alone this appraisal may be right. It is in relation of the individual to the community, however, that this view of education first breaks down. The college has never taught that every man stands for himself alone, nor that the value of education is in its purchasable gratifications. There is a training that should be undergone for the sake of learning and for the benefit of others. This does not eliminate science but emphasizes its value not for a course of technical training but a course in which the culture of science and other liberalizing studies are sought as sound preparation for technical and professional schools and for life. As the college does not look on any man as educated unless he has been taught to interpret the problems of his own day through the lessons of the past and has received a knowledge of classic literature, philosophy and civilization, gaining discipline in the expression of his own tongue through the processes of translation; so it does not look upon any man today as fully trained for modern life who has not learned the methods of the laboratory and laid a secure foundation in science.

In this respect a college curriculum must prove itself. How much language, pure mathematics and philosophy or sociological, scientific and vocational studies should be used, and how to retain the discipline and culture of mind and give equipment for life is the problem to solve. Many experiments are being made and no final solution has been found. Efficiency is the great word of the modern industrial plant. Both man and machinery must work to the top notch of efficiency day in and day out. The training in college is no exception. It is only by careful, conscientious, regular and systematic application, whatever be the studies of the course, that a disci-

pline worth anything can be secured. The college student who seeks mental sloth, carelessness and inaccuracy, which are the antithesis of good education, is counteracting the benefits of a college course and paying too high a price for what he gets out of his four years. A young man under some stern master in office, factory or store, for eight hours or more each day, is part of a carefully organized system, a machine that detects his every lapse and fits him for higher responsibility. The college boy on the other hand is largely accountable to himself as to the use of his time and energy. The mind can be driven but that is not life. Life is voluntary or unconscious. It is breathed in out of a sustaining atmosphere. It is shaped by environment. It is habitual, continuous, productive. After the college authorities have provided the sufficient means in equipment, curriculum, instructors, it nevertheless rests with the student himself as to whether by his own coöperation he secures the desired development.

This leads us a step further into a higher sphere where the will is active and where the college training ought to culminate in the development of spiritual power. Physical strength alone makes the bully. Mental acumen is the tool of the trickster, deceit, crime and sin. Spiritual power, the crown of life, is the determining factor in the highest function of the college in producing perfect manhood. This is undoubtedly the highest test of college life. Physical development and winning athletic teams are desirable but the college which is successful in these and has nothing else to show is in a pitiable plight. To drill students, however well, in language, mathematics, philosophy, economics, sciences and kindred subjects, with no regard to morality or the higher spiritual realities, is no less a travesty on education. We dare not stop short of that discipline of the will which forms not only the driving but the guiding power of personality and makes the useful citizen. This power is invisible and intangible but it is none the less real, although the process of its growth is exceedingly subtle. Students can be driven to physical exercise, and compelled to

undergo mental training but no force or outward restraint can make them moral or spiritual. The college offers this discipline but the student who would profit by it must himself open his heart and soul to its reception and cultivation. This above all other things is genuine college culture. In the four years' course it is the demand of a faithfulness, integrity, honesty, self-sacrifice in play and in work which rounds out the character and spirit of the typical college graduate, fitted for a place of service in life. At every step he meets the moral problem and the manner in which he meets it mars or makes the man. Dishonesty in the class room is as ruinous as deceit on the athletic field. Lack of truthfulness in the routine duties of prescribed work is as disastrous as failure and unfaithfulness in various daily activities.

It is not difficult to realize that the small college is a better field for the cultivation of these qualities than the large institution because the individual touch of students with each other and with the instructors is more intimate. This individual touch is the most valuable thing in college life. To come into intimate acquaintance with a cultured instructor of broad mind and worthy ideals is in itself an inspiration to his whole life. To profit by it students themselves must live in a clean and pure atmosphere. The true life of the college manifests itself not in the class room but in what the students do and talk of and set before themselves as their favorite objects between classes. This is seen in the evening, at the dinner table, in the groups that gather and the men that go off eagerly to their work, where students get together and let themselves go upon their favorite themes—in the effect their studies have upon them when no compulsion of any kind is put upon them. These effects of learning are its real tests alike of its validity and of its efficiency.

Here it is we find the value of student self-government. Students who are being trained for nobler citizenship must have definite part in citizenship. A young man who has had placed upon him the responsibility of self-government will go

into life far better fitted for the responsibilities of citizenship than will the young man who has been governed while in college. If the college exists for the faculty rather than for the student, student government must be a mistake. But if college exists for the student and the faculty are there only as an instrument designed to promote efficiency the result will be a correct development, which is the great end for which colleges exist.

Certainly the moral element of this preparation is not less important than the intellectual. One of the leading engineers of the United States said: "When I wish competent agents to superintend works for which I am responsible, my greatest difficulty is to get good men. I can find twenty who know enough for every one whom I can certainly trust." Uprightness, virtue, Christian manhood, these are sure to tell in the life career. There is no royal road to success in them, but there is a sure road, that begins here, in faithful study and preparation.

I have taken it for granted and implied that moral training is based upon and embraces religion. The earlier colleges in this country were instituted for religious training and religious ends. In a period of reaction students lost spiritual vigor and some were inclined to boast of disgraceful episodes, of lapse in devotion to parents and even dishonor to a heavenly Father. But the college has come into her own again and he is held in highest esteem who leads the clean life, is respectful and tender to his family and friends and is conscious of and faithful in his duties to God. We must believe in something greater than we know. We must have faith in self, faith in the world's need of us, faith in work and a greater faith than these. We must believe that we are unique, that there is nowhere else in the world another man like ourselves; that there is work which we alone can do, that we have been created to render this one service; that this service is discovered to us by our love for self-expression along certain definite channels.

Since we must believe these things—since we must have

faith—why not have the greatest faith it is possible to have? Why not believe that back of this world, which is but a grain of sand in the universe, is the great personality, who is all-wise, all-just, all-loving, who permits no waste to exist in his institution, who is directing all of us in his service, and to whom there are no useless men, no useless institutions? That there are no useless thoughts, no useless words, no useless acts and no useless institutions and that are all doing his work, in his way, in his time—that is faith.

For the sake of success and manhood, lay broad the foundation of education, do not be afraid of learning too much, or of preparing thoroughly for your life's career. It should be the supreme joy of the college man to accelerate progress so that in the generations to come there shall be less of misery, less of iniquity, more of happiness. This is the divine opportunity of the college man; this is the burden imposed upon him. In this work you and I are joined in Franklin and Marshall College and we ask God's blessing upon it.

LANCASTER, PA.

V.

THE CHURCH AND MODERN SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

PAUL B. RUPP.

One of the hackneyed complaints upon the lips of the twentieth century pessimist is that "these days are not like the good old times,"—an expression uttered in a tone which intimates that we are on the downgrade in both morals and religion. This complaint is a survival partly of the traditional belief that the man of today is only a degenerate son of his morally perfect Edenic ancestor; and partly of the widespread conception that the "Golden Age" is a thing of the long distant past. "We are the same that our fathers have been," and worse," says he of the backward look. Thus many consider the conditions of the twentieth century as socially inferior to, and morally worse than, those of any preceding age.

But we deny the reasonableness of such an assumption. It indicates a woful misunderstanding of the lessons of history. We believe that the twentieth century civilization is on a far higher moral and social plane than was that of two thousand years ago when Jesus trod the uplands of Judea. A mere glance at the Old Testament prophecies, for example, reveals the fact that immorality, vice and unsocial conditions were not unknown in the year 800 B. C., but were probably *more* spectacular, blatant and common than they are today; that they constituted the very burden which lay so heavily upon the hearts of the prophets. God sent them to teach Israel that their ways were not His ways; that He would lead them to constantly higher levels of life if they would only follow. If the "Golden Age" lies behind us, then ancient Israel offers no hope for the twentieth century.

If however we regard history as simply the school days of

the human race, then we are in a position to view calmly and deliberately the moral and religious strides of the past, and to look with hope toward a still more splendid future. There is still much truth in the ancient adage that "distance lends enchantment to the view." For we are so far removed from primeval man that we have clothed him in the garments of perfection; and so close to the men and women of today that we cannot appreciate them because of the evil they do.

We know more about the conditions of today than of yesterday. Our newspapers bring to our supper table the story of the murder or the divorce scandal of the morning. Our magazines and novels present the ills of the times in lurid colors, and sometimes in a grossly false light. But the fact that we are able and willing to read of them is a wholesome sign that we are really awakening to their existence. Our forefathers in their own isolated communities knew of no evils other than their immediate own; we know of them as soon as they spring to life,—whether in our own city or in the farthest isles of the sea. And just because so broad is our knowledge of contemporary conditions, the shallow mind is prone to regard the twentieth century as the worst in all history.

But it is the best. Wrongs which our fathers winked at we unhesitatingly condemn. Bad economic conditions which they regarded as providential, as predestined to be, we ascribe to the greed of men, or as incidental to economic evolution; and we stir up the conscience of men, and set in motion all our legal machinery for their removal.

We are willing to face facts as they are, and not as we think they are. Our scientific trend of mind has banished all preconceived opinions and prejudices, so that we are in a position to investigate sanely and soberly the social life of the twentieth century as it unrolls itself before us. And as we study modern life we at once discover that, though we have ascended moral heights to hitherto unheard-of distances, we nevertheless present the picture of a social "crazy-quilt" in which good and bad are commingled without any semblance of justice or order.

In the first place the most superficial kind of investigation will open one's eyes to a very widespread discontent for which there is just cause. "Things are not what they seem." On the surface America never seemed more prosperous. Her industrial system has developed with unparalleled rapidity, and attained an astonishing degree of complexity. Her corporations which thirty years ago were but infant industries today send their products to the four corners of the globe. Our most familiar advertisements meet the tourist along the caravan routes of the Soudan and near the villages of the farthest north. Industry is so systematized that one corporation can manufacture a hundred and more articles with equal ease and economy. According to the last census \$18,428,000,000 were invested in productive enterprises in 1909, while the products at the factories were valued at \$20,672,000,000. Wages and salaries alone totalled \$4,474,000,000, a sum too large to be appreciated, and yet sufficiently great to lead one to infer that every man should have "enough and plenty." But if we divide this amount into salaries and wages, we find that prosperity is a term with which all too few are familiar. Wages would average \$533.00 and salaries \$957.00; while there is no reckoning the amount which found its way into the coffers of the capitalist. This brings us naturally to the economic problem of the times: a more equitable distribution of wealth, the solution of which will go far in settling prevalent discontent.

The wage earner must face the economic problem in one or more of its various aspects every day of his life. Thus a tariff bill is bad to him because it deprives him of warm clothing, or more nutritious food, or even the commonest comforts of life. A public utilities bill is good or bad because he is largely at the mercy of the corporation which the bill is designed to control. Child labor, female labor, the sweatshop, affect him in whole or in part. For 90 per cent. of all our people consist of wage and salaried workers and their families whose interests are vitally bound up with the economic problem. The wage earner feels

that he is not receiving a fair portion of the products of his toil. The "sweater" may fairly wear out his life in stitching the warmest clothing; but he is never able to use it. The mechanic labors ten hours a day in an automobile factory; but the nearest he ever comes to a touring car is in his wild scramble across the city streets as the wheels of the machine just graze him. The textile worker toils many an hour over his spindles; but woolen blankets seldom cover him when night closes his weary eyes. He works so hard and gets so little for all his pains. Moreover, as he goes to his work in the morning or returns home in the evening, he sees his employer, or some other affluent member of his own species, contentedly ensconced in his six cylinder machine, smugly meditating upon his profits and losses. Or he may glance at the evening paper, if he is prosperous enough to subscribe for one, and there read of the latest society ball, at which the dancers wore pumps with diamond-studded heels, and drank enough champagne to have kept himself and family in comfort for a whole year. He knows that sickness will halve his paycheck, and that death will throw his family upon the mercy of a none too merciful world. An angry spirit of revolt surges up within him, and he eagerly welcomes any ism or party which promises him a new arrangement in the social structure. He would receive with open arms any revolution which should guarantee him a more equitable division of that wealth which cost him so much toil and nervous energy, and of which he has received so little. He is inclined to regard society as conspiring against him, in reaping what it had not sown and gathering where it had not scattered. That had been his function, but no bountiful harvest had rewarded his efforts. So he uses one of two weapons at his disposal: the strike or sabotage. In either case, however, he demoralizes industry, while society pays the bill.

But discontent is only one side of the picture, and there is another. It is the positive physical suffering and moral injury

which result from an unjust division of profits. The "speeding-up" system of the average mill and factory so drains the vitality of the wage earner that he has little inclination to cultivate his spiritual powers or develop his mental abilities. In fact the very monotony of his work tends to dwarf both, and initiate a craving for physical stimulation which usually finds its satisfaction in some nearby saloon. His low wage will not permit him to furnish his home with any degree of luxury or comfort. There is nothing to induce him to remain home after nightfall; for it possesses no semblance of real home life. His children—and the wage earner is superlatively prolific—are taken from the school as soon as they reach their earning age, and sent to the mill or the counter to help finance the family. Throughout the day the family is completely broken up into its constituent elements; and, after the evening meal, each must away to the streets, or the cheap theatre, or the dance hall,—and their morals pay the penalty.

This drain upon the vitality of the worker, this dwarfing of his spiritual nature and degeneration of his morals, this breakup of the family life constitute a distinct economic and spiritual loss. No man can do his best work when he is constantly urged to the very limit of his endurance. Nor under the circumstances does he become the most efficient kind of citizen; for his exploitation has created in his mind a lurking suspicion that society is partly to blame for the injustice done him. He knows that society is, or ought to be, his legal partner for life; but he has found that his partner has permitted him to be exploited and browbeaten at will.

Moreover, part of his suspicion has fastened upon the church which, whether rightly or wrongly, he charges with having been arrayed against him for the benefit of the capitalist. He believes that when she should have lifted up her voice in protest against social injustice she has been strangely silent. He labors, therefore, under the impression that the church has complacently taken sides with the capitalist, for he is usually

found upon her roster of membership. So the discontented wage earner avows that if religion tolerates injustice, he will have nothing to do with religion, or with religion's mouth-piece, the Christian church. He indeed regards the church as a potential power for social uplift. He knows that in the past and present, "the church has always been ready to offer comfort in times of distress and illness; she has always engaged in a magnificent philanthropy of which she may well be proud; she has visited the sick and fed the hungry. But she has not gone to the root of social suffering and attempted to cut it." This he well knows; and at the same time he knows that if the church with her millions of adherents were to become really interested in social reform, there is no injustice or oppression which she could not speedily rectify. But because he does not see her using her power in a practical way to uproot the causes which necessitate social reform, the average wage earner holds her partly responsible for social ills. Expecting so much from the church and seeing her do so little makes him suspicious of her sincerity of purpose. So he turns from her spiritual ministrations and pins his faith to a political party as his economic saviour.

That labor has sufficient warrant for its complaint against injustice we have already hinted at. Society seems to be divided into two clearly distinguishable and mutually hostile camps. On the one hand is the wage or salaried worker. On the other is the capitalist who usually lives in the greatest luxury, and who considers his wealth as his own, to do with just as it pleases him. The average capitalist, in fact the average man today, is an extreme individualist who possesses no sense of social unity, and who fails to understand that society's welfare is established only when the welfare of every member of society is secured. The wealth per capita in the United States is reckoned at \$1,300. But with wealth being rapidly concentrated into the hands of the few—10 per cent. owning 70 per cent. of our capital—the great majority have relatively little they can call their own.

During the past two decades great corporations have sprung into existence. Now there is nothing inherently good or bad in a corporation or monopoly *per se*; it is only when the corporation or monopoly has been formed for the express purpose of increasing prices and thus enlarging dividends at the expense of the consuming public, that it creates for itself a name which the public recognizes as bad. And that has been the general tendency of corporations during the past twenty years. While it is true that wages are higher today than in 1893, yet they will buy only 49 per cent. as much as they did then. At the same time the wage earner knows that large dividends are being declared, that the "melon has been cut," but no slice came to him. He believes that he has been tricked out of his commensurate portion of the proceeds of the industry; so he uses the strike as the "big stick" to force a more equitable wage agreement. In the meantime the industry is paralyzed, the public suffers as much as the two contending factions, and the real cause of the strife remains unreached and unsettled.

There are other and kindred questions which should receive consideration in a discussion of this character. The liquor problem, for example, is anti-social in its methods and results. Statistics tell us that 85 per cent. of all our crime is directly traceable to the liquor traffic, and that it furnishes 40 per cent. of our confined insane. Just what relation does alcoholism bear to the wearing drain of the industrial system upon the life of the worker?—is a question which could be discussed with profit, but the limits of this paper forbid.

Again, the white-slave traffic should in justice to the women exploited by it, receive consideration in a discussion of social questions. Just what percentage is caused by low wages?—is a question which is at present being investigated by the legislatures of several states.

Or again, the spirit of speculation, of gambling, has an important place in the social question. What percentage of it is due to the feverish methods—many more or less questionable—of our competitive system?

These and other questions are vitally related to the great social problem of a more just arrangement of our social structure, so that the wage earner may become a more efficient citizen and valuable social factor.

* * * * *

And now what should be the attitude of the church toward this problem, or toward any problem of kindred nature? In a few words we answer: that of sympathetic counsellor and guide. The function of labor organizer the church dare not assume under penalty of losing her birthright of a spiritual mission for the mess of pottage of passing popularity. She might court and for a time receive popular favor by allying herself organically with labor in all its undertakings; she might place upon her bulletin boards: "This is Labor's Church," and perhaps enjoy crowded attendances upon her services. We say *perhaps*, for it is a mooted question whether labor desires especially a workingman's church or one vitally interested in labor's problems. The church for her own sake must not be of and for a distinct class. That bulletin board would lead men to infer that economic questions in which the workingman is vitally interested constitute the burden of discussion by the pulpit. But a frequent attendance upon such a "labor church" would soon pall upon him; for the labor lyceums afford more expert discussions upon economic problems than that which the average minister so academically presents on Labor Sunday, for example. Socialistic ministers do not long retain their crowds. People instinctively associate a religious message with the pulpit, rather than a vapid tirade against the modern social organization. But what the workingman wants, and has a right to expect, is a religious message applied to his own peculiar conditions, rather than a discourse upon the ancient Hittites and Egyptians. The wage earner is living in the twentieth century, and he is being exploited by modern Egyptians who are compelling him to make bricks without straw, to forge the finest tools and manufacture the most delicate fabrics without recompensing him in a man-

ner which will maintain his highest efficiency. He, therefore, looks to the church to attempt a social reform through the promulgation of moral principles which shall be just as binding upon his wealthy employer as upon himself. The average workingman asserts that in past years the church trimmed her message to suit the tender sensibilities of her wealthy pewholder; and he has therefore permitted his own loyalty to the church to grow somewhat cold. While he considers the church to be a moral agency for the promotion of justice which cannot be gainsaid, he yet expects her to make good her claim to bring peace on earth and good will to men.

Now the church is recognizing her responsibility for the promotion of social justice, though she is not always clear as to the best method she ought to pursue to gain her end. During the past twenty-five years she has adopted the institutional idea for directly ministering to those who have been caught in the grip of the social problem. Thus she has built her gymnasiums, her bowling alleys, and swimming pools; she has established her kindergartens, her day nurseries, and training classes; she keeps her reading rooms and amusement parlors open day and night,—in the hope of alleviating misery and suffering, and curbing discontent. And yet, good as these agencies are for the promotion of culture and healthfulness among the people, and for a testimony to the fraternal spirit of the faith, they cannot by any means be regarded as a permanent solution of the social question. In many cases the institutional idea has been adopted solely for the purpose of self-preservation in a rapidly changing community. And in all cases it is simply the method of the physician who treats individual cases of disease without at the same time investigating their causes. Charity must, indeed, be the dominant note of the church's activity; but a charity which is content with ministering to the externals of poverty and privation, rather than in uprooting the causes which make charity necessary, is only blindness and a "beating against the wind."

In dealing with the social question the church must first of

all hark back to the primary purpose which Jesus ever kept in mind: The preaching of the gospel of the Kingdom of God whose central idea is concerned with two fundamental facts: the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It required nearly eighteen hundred years for her to learn the lesson of God's Fatherhood; the present age clamors for brotherhood. That must be incarnated in the message of the modern pulpit. This idea of brotherhood she must especially preach to the sons of wealth; the very poverty of the poor compels them to practice brotherhood.

Thus the modern church must lay especial stress upon the stewardship of wealth. This idea she did not indeed forget in past years, but she preached it all too feebly. She was more concerned about the purity of doctrine and correctness of belief than about the application of both doctrine and belief to personal living for both rich and poor. But today people are suspicious of doctrine, unfortunately too much so, and demand a message which shall prove a spiritual dynamic in transforming the topsy-turvy social order.

She must tell men in no uncertain terms that wealth is a good only when it is sought for the sake of the *social good* one can do with it, rather than for its own sake or for one's own personal enjoyment. When churchmen are clothed in purple and fine linen and fare sumptuously every day, while their brothers are rotting out their lives in dirty tenement houses; when rich fools squander a fortune upon a banquet given to pet cats, while men and women are starving in the slums of the same city; when, in other words, wealth owns the man rather than the man the wealth, then it becomes a social evil, and the man becomes a downright sinner, regardless of the fact that a thousand clerks obey his call, or that he holds the office of elder in a Christian church. The Kingdom of God, or the democracy of brothers, whichever one chooses to call it, must be the theme of the modern church as it was of the ancient, or of the Christ. When men can devour widow's houses and then salve their guilty consciences with a check of five or more

figures for some church philanthropy, without any protest from the church herself, then she need not be surprised when the denizen of the slums shrugs his shoulders at the mention of her name, and calls her the little sister of the rich. Her Sunday Schools must promote into the congregation young men and women who are imbued with the supreme ideal of brotherhood, not indeed of the elect, but of both prodigal and elder brother, of rich and poor.

But the church cannot afford to identify herself with any political group for the reorganization of society, much as she believes in the necessity for such reorganization. Political groups naturally use only political methods which at best are only temporary, confined to a decade or a generation. Thus prior to the civil war she allied herself with the abolition party in the north and with the slavery party in the south, and as a logical consequence she was split in twain. But through the foolishness of preaching she must teach her members moral and spiritual principles which have a *social* application. It is true she must still attempt to reach individuals in order to regenerate society, for only out of good individuals can a good society be formed. But her modern task is to transform the natural individualism of the individual into the social conscience of the Christian. In the past men have proved themselves generous brothers to individuals, but did not hesitate to act as grafters and exploiters towards society as a whole. The modern church must attempt to give the individual man a social vision, so to train him in his Christian course that he will adopt the fraternal attitude towards society as well as towards the members of his own household. His individual ethics must be converted into a social ethics. Brotherhood is not individualistic, monastic, ascetic, but social,—else it is not brotherhood. Thus the church must steer clear of social reforms by political methods, for “reforms are for church members, and not for churches.” She must on the other hand prove the agency through which God inspires individual men and women with a social vision, so that they will go out of her serv-

ices into the world, and purge it of its injustice and oppression, and bring to pass peace and good will. Her message is still for the individual to make of him a Christian and a brother.

Again, while she should voice the necessity of social reform she must insist that reform be effected through the inspiration of religious enthusiasm rather than by means of merely legal expedients. In their haste to regenerate society men have ever been inclined to become revolutionists, forgetful of the saying, "they that use the sword shall perish by the sword." In their zeal they lose sight of decency and order, and frequently hold in contempt the law itself. They justify the means by the nobility of their aims and end; they hold their own will and understanding superior to the will and standards of society. Thus we occasionally find reform candidates buying votes for the sake of the good cause they represent; thus rabid suffragettism burns property and defies the law because it so intensely believes in the righteousness of its aims and in its ability to use the ballot; thus the Industrial Workers of the World employ all the methods of the anarchist in order to usher the workingman into his rightful inheritance.

Now, in all her preaching the church must always insist upon the majesty of the law. For a due regard to the law which is only the publicly expressed will of society, is the first guarantee of all progress and legal reform and "of the permanence of the good law which must inevitably replace the bad." There is no organization or individual so fitted by history and training to stand for this fact as the church. Lawlessness marks both the anarchist and the recipient of special privilege. In fact it is the lawless methods of the latter which are largely responsible for the discontent and lawlessness of the former. The lobbyist buys off the lawmaker for the sake of his own personal gain, despite any harmful results which might thereby accrue to the public. But a virile church, which believes in the democracy of man, must sternly set her face against *all* lawlessness, whether by the I. W. W. or the greatest corpora-

tion in the land. She must declare in no uncertain terms that the law is good if men use it lawfully, and that a law-abiding attitude is the only guarantee that the next generation will be law-abiding. The church must still stand upon authority, in dealing with social questions, but upon the authority of the moral law and the legally expressed social will. She must assert without fear or favor that the individual is sovereign only when his will accords with the social will. He should be taught to realize that in addition to his sovereignty he has a social duty to perform; and only as he performs that duty in the spirit of obedience to lawfully constituted authority does he fulfill his high obligations of Christian citizenship.

In the next place the church has it altogether in her power to guarantee sanity in reform. One of the very real dangers and nuisances in any age of transition is the radical, the fanatic, the crank, each with his own pet method and narrow view, and promising a millennial dawn. On the one hand we find the extremist who promises a regenerated society by the selective processes of eugenics; on the other, is no less an extremist who makes the same guarantee, but by the refinements of eugenics. From the free-trader who preaches a reasonable cost of living by the utter demolition of the tariff wall, to the socialist who guarantees an economic redemption by state ownership and operation of all productive enterprises,—one and all they add to the noisy din of social agitators. All are doubtless sincere in their purposes, but many are totally impractical in their methods and impatient for results. Now agitators are necessary for all progress, but "an agitator who is mad with altruism is just as dangerous as any other madman."

Sanity in reform is the one element indispensable for its permanence. Wholesale iconoclasm and denunciation only add fuel to the fires of lawlessness. That the Christ and the early church fully realized, and that the modern church must recognize. Jesus came to found the ideal social order by preaching the universal doing of God's will; but Jesus declined to hasten its coming by spectacular methods or illegiti-

mate processes. St. Paul knew that the Gospel of Jesus spelled the doom of slavery; but the apostle nevertheless sent the slave Onesimus back to his Christian master Philemon, trusting to the latter's sense of brotherhood as a guarantee of right treatment for the former. Ambrose both aroused and restrained the Milanese; Luther both aroused the German peasants by his preaching and then condemned them for their lawlessness; and down through the centuries the church has ever stood for decency and order in all sorts of reform, which simply must come if the gospel is preached consistently and in its purity.

In the past, and even in the present, the church has been charged with indifference to social wrongs, or with the *laissez faire* policy, because she would not rush headlong into every reform fathered by every hot-headed agitator. But she was probably wiser than she knew. For permanent reform does not come over night, even as the evils aimed at did not spring up over night. But she went directly to the source of the evils, even *inhuman greed*, and denounced it in more or less cogent terms, believing that only the preaching of God's Fatherhood and man's Brotherhood could transform inhuman greed into Christian love. It required years and centuries to make her impression, but she made it; for the social life of today is on a far higher moral plane than it was in the day of her origin. That attitude she must unswervingly maintain, though she must restore to her message what she forgot one thousand years ago: that man's *whole* duty is not performed until he acts as a brother to society at large, as well as to the individual in particular. She is in a position, as the average reformer is not by reason of his lack of perspective, to understand that true reforms come slowly, because the Kingdom of God come slowly, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear."

Finally, she must insist that all her members catch this vision of brotherhood. She is the inspirer through the power of her indwelling Saviour, and her members must act on her

inspiration. In a broad sense she is the fountain, her members are the streams which flow into all of society's bypaths, bringing refreshing and sweetening influences to wearied and burdened souls. Her members are the leaven which will in time leaven the whole social lump. And only as her members do thus live among their fellows according to the fraternal vision which she inspires, will discontent give way to peace, goodwill supplant selfish aggrandisement, and the kingdoms of the world become the kingdoms of the Lord and His Christ.

McKEESPORT, PA.

VI.

SHALL WE PRAY FOR RAIN?

RAY H. DOTTERER.

A pastor was visiting a country parishioner, an old man who came over from Prussia a half-century ago. The parishioner's connection with the congregation was somewhat loose. In fact he was not a member in the strict sense of the term, but belonged to the always-present, uncertain fringe of adherents. Having received a fairly good German education in his youth, and being a man of considerable natural ability, he was frankly sceptical concerning some of the articles of belief commonly regarded in the churches as essential. He took great pleasure, too, in airing his doubts, and liked to take the negative side in a friendly debate. At the time of the pastor's visit there was great need of rain; accordingly, the sceptical parishioner suggested in a bantering way that the parson pray for rain. "It can't do any harm, and might do some good," he added. The suggestion made in such a manner deserved no consideration, and received little. But what if such a request had been made seriously and sincerely?

Shall we pray for rain? Is it proper to offer petitions for material benefits? Is it reasonable for a Christian in this day of natural science to seek to change the future by means of prayer?

1. *The Destructive Argument.*—The course of events, at least in the world of material phenomena, is fixed. Effect has been produced by cause, and each cause has in turn been an effect of a preceding cause since the beginning of the series (if there was a beginning), and the same causes will produce the same effects to the end of time (if there be an end). The history of natural science is a record of the triumphant prog-

ress of the human mind in explaining phenomena as particular cases of general laws. There was a time when nature seemed only a small island in the immense ocean of the supernatural. By Copernicus and Newton, nature was extended to fill all space; by Darwin, to include all time. It is no longer satisfactory to divide existence into two parts, and to say of the one, "It is the product of Nature," and of the other, "It is the creation of God." All phenomena are included in nature, and take place in accordance with law. To pray for rain (or for the cessation of rain), in the hope of changing the weather, is therefore a foolish endeavor. No one nowadays thinks of seeking by means of prayer to turn aside a comet; no one thinks of asking God to hasten or retard, still less to prevent, an eclipse. Now there can be no doubt that the weather is just as law-abiding as the movements of comets, planets, and satellites. Meteorology is a science as truly as astronomy. The only reason we are tempted to think of next month's weather as undetermined, while we never think of the eclipses of the next century otherwise than as determined, is the fact that we know less about the former. The principles of meteorology are not so well understood as the laws of astronomy. They are probably more complicated. But it is not too much to hope that some day the science of the weather will reach the stage of definite and sure prediction. When that day comes, will we pray for rain?

When we say that the course of nature is fixed, that eclipses and storms are determined in their occurrence by unchanging laws, we are not denying the omnipotence of God. Natural law is unchanging; yet not, theoretically, unchangeable. The writer believes in human "freedom." He believes also in that "free will" of God which the theologians call "transcendence." God is not the slave of Nature, or a passive spectator of the operation of a system of natural laws. He is the source and ground of Nature. A natural law is not a subordinate or semi-independent deity; a natural law is only a description of God's mode of operation. The problem of "answers to

prayer" cannot be solved, however, by appealing simply to Omnipotence, or by drawing a hazy analogy between God's conduct of the world and a man's working upon his environment. It is not a question of what God *can* do, but of what He actually does. We have good authority for the statement that He sends his rain on the just and the unjust, presumably also on the praying and the prayerless. The tornado takes its course over untilled wilderness and fertile farm and populous city with sovereign impartiality. Conceivably, Omnipotence might prevent the storm, or at least turn it aside so that it would not strike the more crowded abodes of man; but Omnipotence does not "interfere." For some reason God acts in accordance with those uniformities of cause and effect, which we call the laws of nature. No doubt the reason is sufficient in His sight.

By entreaty we may sometimes prevail upon a man to do for us or for others what would otherwise remain undone. With the best heart in the world he may not know our needs. We enlighten him, and, rejoicing in the opportunity to serve, he wills that our petition be granted. His "free will" initiates a new causal series in nature, and we obtain that for which we asked. Or, with full knowledge of our needs, the man may be indifferent or even hostile. By our entreaty we change his heart, and the result is the same. But no one will accuse God of imperfect knowledge of our needs, still less of indifference to them. He knows all that we know and more; His love is perfect. All the prayers of all the saints cannot instruct or persuade Him. Our Father knoweth what we have need of before we ask Him. His love impels Him to seek the best for all His children. If we, nevertheless, pray for rain, or for material benefits in general, are we not in immanent danger of seeking to set up our judgment of what is right and best in opposition to His?

2. *Criticism and Reconstruction.*—In the name of consistent thinking about God and the world we are on the point of suggesting the omission of the "prayer for rain." But can

we stop here? Consistency is a hard master. If we must cease praying for material benefits can we continue to pray for spiritual blessings? We may perhaps assume that the reign of law is less absolute in the realm of spirit than in the realm of matter; yet it may turn out that this assumption is possible only because of our ignorance of the laws of spirit. It may be a case of meteorology and astronomy on a grander scale. However this may be the argument is not fundamentally vitiated; for here too God's love and knowledge are not capable of improvement as a result of our efforts. Are we to suppose that God is made more desirous of saving the world, by the prayers of men? Certainly our intercessions are not necessary. Whether we pray or neglect to pray, He is continually granting His saving grace to all who wish to receive it. Whether we pray or neglect to pray, He is calling men to preach the gospel. Again, in accordance with the same line of argument, the prayer for help in overcoming temptation, or for the conversion of loved ones gone astray, is needless. God certainly desires that men overcome temptation, and we cannot imagine that He will withhold His grace from any erring brother, because someone has neglected to intercede for that brother.

Can we stop even here? Why give thanks? How do we know which is bane and which is blessing? Both sometimes appear in disguise. Moreover why tell Him that we are thankful? He knows before we tell Him. Confession of sin is proved unnecessary by the same argument; for the Searcher of hearts is not ignorant of our penitence. Adoration, too, and praise must now appear quite superfluous, because we can tell God nothing about His power and glory, about His justice, love, and mercy, which He did not know before.

Clearly, then, if the prayer for rain must be given up, with it must go not only all petitions for material benefits, but petition in general, and all the other elements of prayer,—adoration, confession, thanksgiving. The implications of the destructive argument have carried us so far as to suggest a

reductio ad absurdum. At least there ought to be a careful search for an erroneous premise, before deciding to rest content with the conclusion stated in the preceding paragraph. And we have not far to seek. The erroneous premise is the assumption, common to many of the opponents and the defenders of prayer, that its efficacy ought to be proved by objective results. The scientist suggests a test analogous to the experiments of a chemical or physical laboratory. The religious devotee labors diligently in the endeavor to collect numerous accounts of "remarkable answers." Even when it is conceded that the primary purpose of prayer is to achieve subjective results, and that the true end to be sought is not the bending of God's will into agreement with the will of the petitioner, but rather to bring the latter's will into conformity with the will of God; it is nevertheless said that unless men *hope* to receive objective answers to their prayers, "there will be little praying done." Even if this pessimistic view were true, it would have no relevancy to our present discussion. The merchant has no moral right to misrepresent his goods, even in the laudable endeavor to increase his trade; the religious leader has no right to teach untruth or half-truth even for the praiseworthy purpose of fostering the habit of worship. Better that prayer should cease than that men should be insincere. But the case is not nearly so bad as the pessimists have thought. Men will continue to seek communion with God, even though petition, in the strict meaning of the term, fall into disuse. It is erroneous to assume that prayer is unreasonable unless it can be proved to effect changes in God and in the world.

Prayer is valuable, and indeed indispensable, not because it effects changes in God and in the world, but because it effects changes in and through man. Difficult as this is to understand, God's work in and through man is conditioned by man's receptivity. Now humble, trustful, submissive prayer is the opening of man's heart, that God may enter and take possession. Dropping the language of theology, and employing that of psychology instead, prayer changes the one who prays, and

through him influences other men, and indirectly changes things. These forms of prayer—adoration, confession, thanksgiving—which do not suggest an answer in the ordinary sense furnish a key to the understanding of the efficacy of petition. They are a potent means of placing the one who prays in right emotional relation to God. When we adore, confess, and give thanks, we are not trying to tell God anything, but we are giving expression to sentiments which well up spontaneously in our hearts and demand utterance. In accordance with a well-known principle of psychology, by thus permitting our religious sentiments to find expression we strengthen them. The reflex effect of petition is similar. As we express our desires in the form of petitions, we strengthen them. Moreover, our desires are purified thereby; for in prayer it is our highest self that speaks. In the realized presence of God, the low and unworthy inclinations of our complex self retreat into the background.

The question remains, however, whether we can reasonably offer petitions, when we do not believe that they have any objective efficacy. We have no more expectation that our prayer will change the weather, than that it will alter the regular succession of day and night. Can we then pray for rain?

If we continue to employ the language of petition our only purpose is "to bring our desires before God." This trite phrase, however, is not quite accurate. Speaking more accurately we put our desires into words in order to compare them with our concept of the purposes of God. Petition is thus a means employed in the endeavor to achieve a God-centered life. Our Father indeed knows all our desires, fears, hopes, plans, and ambitions before we tell him of them. We do not really tell Him; but we act the part of telling Him, in order the better to see our thoughts, as it were, against a background of His thoughts. Thus we teach ourselves to desire only what we think He desires; we train ourselves to submit to what appears to be His will; we bring ourselves to see all life, including our

own little lives, in the perspective of eternity. Thus we approximate more closely to "the mind which was in Christ Jesus," which is the mind of God.

Now this may be done—and, if this article has any point, this is the point—this may be done just as well, and in some cases better, by dropping the language of petition, and employing instead the language of desire, hope, or trust. This suggestion is offered not to those for whom there is no problem of prayer, but only to those who feel the incongruity of petition with their conception of God and the world.

To illustrate what is meant, there is a collect in the office prescribed by our Order of Worship for the Holy Communion which reads thus: "Vouchsafe unto us, we beseech Thee, favorable weather, that the fruits of the earth may ripen and be gathered in for us in due season; and be pleased of Thy great goodness to preserve us from war, pestilence, and famine."

Translated from the form of petition to that of simple desire, or wishing, it might read somewhat as follows:—"O Father, Thou knowest our dependence upon the weather. We desire that it may be favorable, so that the fruits of the earth may ripen, and be gathered in in due season. We hope to be spared from pestilence and famine and from the ravages of war. Yet we wish to receive submissively and without repining, whatsoever may come into our lives in accordance with Thy most holy will."

This is doubtless crude and stilted enough. The original is poetry. The paraphrase is prose. Yet poorly done as it is, it illustrates the idea. The next collect is as follows: "Send forth Thy light and Thy truth unto the ends of the earth; cause the glorious gospel of Thy grace to be proclaimed among all nations, and powerfully incline the hearts of men everywhere, that they may hear and obey the joyful sound." Changed as suggested above, this collect might assume a form such as this: "We know, O Father, that Thou art continually sending forth Thy light and Thy truth into receptive hearts; Thou art causing the glorious gospel of Thy grace to be pro-

claimed among all nations; and we desire that men everywhere may hear and obey the joyful sound."

Though for the sake of convenience the suggestion has been illustrated by paraphrasing two collects of a formal public prayer, such an avoidance of the language of petition is not so needful in prayers of this kind as in so-called free prayer, whether public or private. In the former of the quoted collects the change suggested seems desirable; in the second it seems unnecessary; for even as the collect stands originally the form of petition is for most readers and hearers no more than a poetical expression of a heartfelt wish for the enlightenment and salvation of all men. In liturgical prayer petition usually occupies a relatively subordinate place, being overshadowed by adoration, praise, and thanksgiving; and furthermore, the petitions necessarily have to do, not with the specific boons craved by individuals, but rather with the more general blessings desired by civil and religious communities. Petitions that the gospel be preached, that the poor and afflicted be comforted, that the nation become more truly Christian are in effect no more than expressions of desire on the part of the petitioners. Hardly any one utters them in the sense of literal petition. No one supposes that they increase God's love for the heathen or for the "unchurched masses," or that they cause Him to regard the poor and the afflicted with greater compassion, or that they deepen His solicitude for our nation. Infinite love is not capable of increase.

The phrases "sunrise" and "sunset" remain in our ordinary speech as survivals of the language of the pre-Copernican astronomy. Literally interpreted, they contain an untruth; but they do no harm and cause no misunderstanding, because no one interprets them literally. In the same way certain petitions may be retained in prayer, if they are not misunderstood. But it should not be forgotten that even these petitions are survivals of the pre-scientific view of the world in its relation to supernatural powers. In the interpretation of poetry, "the letter killeth." But if people do not insist on making

prose out of the poetry of prayer, the language of petition may be retained.

In private prayer, however, and in extemporaneous public prayer, the poetry tends to disappear, petition usually occupies a somewhat larger place, and the things asked for are nearly always more specific and material. It may therefore be a helpful suggestion that those at least who feel scruples about petitioning for specific blessings, should substitute for the trite phrases, "Bless, we beseech Thee," "Grant," "Give," "Send down," "Draw nigh," etc., the equally simple phrases, "We desire," "We wish," "We know," "We hope," "We believe," "We trust," and the like. Such a translation from one form of expression to the other might not be carried through consistently. One might find himself frequently slipping back into the old language of petition, and no harm would be done. The point is that the influence of the *Zeit Geist* is unfavorable to prayer in the sense of petition. We are all to a greater or less degree under the spell of the view of the world fostered by natural science. Under this influence we have ceased to pray for many things for which our fathers offered up most fervent petitions to the throne of grace. Prayer ought to be a sovereign remedy for worry; but many a man fails to take his troubles to the Lord in prayer, because petition for specific blessings seems to him foolish as well as presumptuous. Let him now give up the thought of changing things, and think instead of changing himself. If he is unwilling to employ the customary language of petition, let him, taking heart from the sentiment of Phillips Brooks, that "A prayer, in its simplest function, is merely a wish turned heavenward," employ instead the language of desire, wishing, trust and hope.

Shall we then pray for rain? Yes; we believe that God is well pleased to have us bring all our wants and worries to Him. Let us pray, however, not to bring the rain, not in the vain hope of changing the order of nature, but to learn to submit patiently to drought, if that is God's will. In order that

the true purpose of the prayer may not be lost sight of, it may be in this case especially advantageous to substitute a simple statement of desire for the ordinary form of asking. Thus the farmer may pray: "Father, we thy children wish for rain. We hope that it will come in time to produce a bountiful harvest; nevertheless we desire to receive humbly and thankfully as from Thy hand whatever Thy world-order shall bring to us. Amen."

BALTIMORE, Md.

VII.

BENEFICIARY EDUCATION IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

IN TWO PARTS.

PART I.

CLAYTON H. RANCK.

Much of what has been spoken and written in recent years on the subject before us assumes that the scarcity of ministerial students and the matter of beneficiary aid, are problems now confronting the Church for the first time in her history. To show that this is not the case is one of the purposes of this article. Beneficiary education is not a modern idea. The institution,—if we may call efforts upon one line of work without any common basis of operation such,—dates back many centuries and that there were obstacles to be met in its proper administration appear very early.

Definite plans for rendering aid to ministerial students were in existence at a very early date. Bishop Lightfoot sees them in the schools of the prophets among the Hebrews, Charlemagne had a very definite policy involving beneficiary education for the Christianization of western Europe, Ranke gives several references to the same in his *History of the Popes*, John Knox used this means of supplying the much needed men for the Lord's work, Ursinus was supported in this way, and John Calvin gave an order which the French Synod reiterated a number of times, that "every fifth penny of all our charities shall be set apart" for this object.

Of the early efforts in this direction the society formed in England under the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell was the most elaborately wrought out. In its workings provision was made for five years of preparatory and classical study and three for the theological course. It was maintained by annual

subscriptions, which were to run eight years and demanded in return that, "the scholars must be of eminent parts, of ingenious disposition, and such as are poor, or have not a sufficient maintenance any other way; and it required that a special regard be had to Godliness."¹ (This society assisted worthy students in all departments of study.) In our own land, the principle of aiding indigent students in their courses of study dates back to the beginning of things, and indicates an earnest desire on the part of those concerned, for a thoroughly equipped ministry.

For many years the work was done without an organization of any kind. When students were prepared for the ministry by preceptors they without doubt received many unpaid services, and cheerfully would one record the stories of such deeds were they available. The same kind of service was given by the teachers in the small academy, whose salaries were so meager that their services were almost a gift to the students, but again their deeds died with them. The first records appear when the church began to take action for the welfare of these students.

Synodic action in the Presbyterian Church dates from the middle of the eighteenth century. An early report of their Board of Education says: "As far back as the days of Makemie (?-1708) when our ministers numbered less than the apostles, our church acted upon the two great principles which now govern the Board of Education, viz., that the increase of the ministry is connected with the use of means, and that both piety and learning are essential qualifications for the office."

Dr. Ashbel Green at the laying of the corner stone of Princeton Seminary expressed this sentiment on the subject before us: "I consider the agency I have had in providing ministers of the gospel for the church, and in securing the means for their adequate instruction, and for an attention to their personal piety as the most important service that I have rendered to the Church of Christ." "Supply and demand,"

¹ *Princeton Rev.*, April, 1876, pp. 236-64.

says another, "are not operative, where the greatest want exists the least need is felt," and another cries: "One half to two thirds of the families cannot pay for their sons, occasionally the young man with sufficient ability [to earn his own way] can be found but, success achieved in this way is, in many cases, at the expense of the longest and most useful life."

The policy at this early date and until a very recent period was to assist those who had come forward rather than to try to induce young men to come by offering them assistance.

Then as now each decade seemed to consider itself more in need of ministers than any previous one. "When the American Education Society was formed in 1816," says Barber,² "there were in the whole country only about 1,500 liberally educated ministers—one to every 6,000 souls. And this ratio was rapidly lessening."³ In 1840 Dr. Griffin writes: "There is nothing on earth wanted so much, but the Spirit of God, as an *increase of well educated evangelical ministers*," and Dr. Beecher in 1838 says:⁴ "Never was there a time when there was more disposition to receive well-educated and pious ministers. If there were now an addition of 10,000 they could all be settled. But how shall the supply be obtained? It must be mainly through the instrumentality of education societies."

These Education Societies had their beginning in the Baptist Church in the last decade of the eighteenth century. They were not however separate organizations, but a department of Associations working in a number of lines of Christian activity. The Warren and Charleston Associations established Education Funds in 1791 and the latter had expended \$3,397 in assisting young men in preparing for the ministry by 1810.⁵ In 1804 a local society was formed by the Congregational association meeting at Pawlet, Vt., and about the same time the Assembly of the Presbyterean Church acted upon the question.

² *Princeton Rev.*, April, 1876, p. 261.

³ "The German Reformed Church has (1829) 400 congregations and but 90 ministers, and only 10 students in the seminary." (Quoted from report.)

⁴ See Dr. Beecher's address in New York City.

⁵ See *Am. Ch. Hist.*, II, p. 381.

In 1815, the "American Society for Educating Pious Youth for the Gospel Ministry," afterwards known as the "American Education Society," was organized in Boston. This organization to which we shall refer later in giving the facts concerning the work at Mercersburg and in the Ohio Synod, is interdenominational and has given aid to more than 8,000 men and about 30 colleges.⁶ In 1819 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church organized its own Board of Education which has aided between 7,000 and 8,000 students for the ministry. A number of congregational societies were formed in our Church in 1827 and the work was taken up by the Lutherans in the early thirties. The "Society for the Increase of Ministers in the Episcopal Church" was formed in 1857 and has helped about 1,100 and in 1862 the "Evangelistic Education Society" of the same Church began its work of helping men, and has aided more than 600.

These organizations for the most part have very definite rules covering the conduct, character, and work demanded of the students. The Evangelistic Education Society accepts on an average but one third of the applicants and the Society for the Increase of Ministers requires a class grade of seventy per cent. and drops those who do not continue to reach this grade.

That those receiving aid were the objects of criticism, some justly but far more unjustly given, seems to have been the case from a very early period, and the reports of the various boards of education take occasion to bring forward all the available facts to counteract the influence of such criticism, and to give the students fair treatment at the hands of the church, and everything but Christian fellowship not to mention charity is often evident in the nasty insinuations from those who have never taken the trouble to look into the facts in the case.

The history of the public actions on beneficiary aid in our own Church dates from the beginning of our educational opera-

⁶ See *Am. Ch. Hist.*, III, pp. 326-327. These and all subsequent figures concerning other churches than the Reformed are at least five years old.

tions. In 1826 it was "Resolved, That Mr. B—— receive \$50.00 from the Treasurer of Synod to continue his studies at the Institute at Carlisle."⁷ Synodic action on the subject followed in abundance. The following year the committee appointed by the board of directors of the Theological Seminary to lay before the Synod the proceedings of that body reported, that "The Board of Directors solicit the most earnest coöperation of this Synod in providing support for indigent students, as will be seen by referring to the minutes of this Board."⁸ Dr. Lewis Mayer reported at the same meeting: "They (the students) would be all willing to remain another year, if they could obtain the necessary support,"⁹ and the board of directors of the Seminary urged the Synod "to enjoin on each minister in this connection to collect in his respective congregations at least five dollars annually, or to pay that sum from their own funds, toward providing a fund for the assistance of necessitous students." Synod approved of this action of the Board and it was "Resolved, that it be, and is hereby enjoined on each minister in this connection to comply with the same."

"Resolved, That \$50.00 from the treasurer be loaned Mr. S—— (if he require it), to enable him to continue his studies."

"Resolved, That Messrs. B—— and D—— receive \$50.00 each from the Treasury, on loan, to enable them to prosecute their studies."¹⁰

The report of the committee on the state of religion for the same year states the following. "Before finishing the narrative of the state of religion, it rejoices us to state, that the church is beginning to awaken to the important concerns of Missionary and Education operations. During the past year 'The American Missionary Society of the German Reformed Church' has been organized and promises great usefulness to

⁷ See Minutes of Synod, 1826, p. 15.

⁸ Min. of Syn., 1827, p. 7.

⁹ Min. of Syn., 1827, p. 13.

¹⁰ Min. of Syn., 1827, p. 23.

the destitute in the midst of us: and, with a view of educating poor and pious young men for the ministry of reconciliation, several societies have, within a few months been formed."¹¹

To those who are interested and familiar with the most excellent work done by the ladies' missionary societies of our own and other denominations during the past generation, it will be a matter of no little interest to note that this work of beneficiary education was fostered during its early years chiefly by the ladies, through organizations known as "Female Education Societies," a name that would suggest the education of women to our generation. Gifts are on record from female education societies in Chambersburg, Emmitsburg, York, Frederick, Mercersburg, Easton, and Pittsburg. The Chambersburg society seems to have done the largest work, and is credited with gifts amounting to more than \$500 between the years of 1839 and 1850. Gifts from congregations and charges, without naming the society if such existed, are recorded from Easton, Lebanon, Reading, Perry County, and St. Thomas. Of these the Easton congregation was most energetic, contributing more than \$230 between the years 1846 and 1850. Certainly very liberal gifts for that time.

Another movement in the interest of beneficiary education aided our Church at this time. In 1828 a representative of the "American Education Society," to which reference has been made above, appeared before the Synod and spoke in the interest of that organization. A committee was appointed to consider the suggestions made by the representative and reported "That they approve of the object of the Society, to assist indigent pious, and hopeful young men, of all Christian denominations, who are desirous of devoting themselves to the Gospel ministry: and that they recommend to the congregations in our connection, where it can be done, to render assistance to that Society in their laudable undertaking."¹² The results of this action are no longer visible, for in 1836 when

¹¹ See Appendix to the Minutes of Synod, 1827, p. 26.

¹² Min. of Syn., 1828, p. 13.

the Rev. William Patton, agent of the "American and Presbyterian Education Societies," visited Synod and we are told¹³ "gave an expose of the principles and operations of the 'American and Presbyterian Education Societies,' a committee was appointed to confer with Mr. Patton which recommended the principles and rules of the American and Presbyterian Societies and that the Board of Education of the Synod be authorized to obtain aid from the Education Society at New York, and to coöperate with said Society." The same committee recommended the appointment by the Board of Education of such an examining committee as the interest of beneficiary education may in their judgment require, also the appointment of an agent who should devote his entire time to this work.

That the assistance received from the American and Presbyterian societies was a large factor in the rapid growth of the student body at Mercersburg, seems to have been overlooked by our historians. In 1838 when thirty beneficiary students were in attendance there, fifteen of them were supported by these boards,¹⁴ and the withdrawal of aid from that source on the following year necessitated a special meeting of the Board of Education at Frederick, "occasioned by the peculiar critical condition in which our education affairs were suddenly placed at that time. The American Board of Education, to whose kindness we are indebted for the support extended to about one half of the beneficiaries at our institutions during the several past years,, were necessitated to withdraw their aid from these young men, on account of their own straitened circumstances. It consequently devolves upon our own Board to provide for the support of those who were thus left destitute."¹⁵ But this was not the end of aid from this society for it assisted the work in the Ohio Synod from 1868 to 1875,¹⁶ to which reference will be made later.

But to return to the activities of Synod. Loans not to

¹³ Min. of Syn., 1836, pp. 6, 7, and 14.

¹⁴ See Min. of Syn., 1838, p. 41.

¹⁵ See Min. of Syn., 1839, p. 52.

¹⁶ See Minutes of Ohio Synod, 1868, p. 38, and 1875, p. 19.

exceed \$80 were made to two necessitous students in 1828, but the next year Dr. Mayer suggested that as this work required too much time to be managed by the Synod it should be committed either to "a Standing Committee or to the Visitors of the Seminary or to an Education Society. The best appointment perhaps would be to entrust them, with certain restrictions to be prescribed by Synod, to the Visitors of the Seminary, who may be authorized to act instead of an Education Society." This suggestion was approved by Synod and in addition the Board of Visitors were requested "to make some permanent regulations for this purpose, and employ requisite measures to obtain the means; and that they guard especially against appropriations to unworthy applicants."¹⁷

The work conducted under the Board of Education was not large, but it grew steadily. In 1832 there were ten men to receive aid. In 1833, five, in 1834, seven, and in 1837 when twenty-one men are reported as beneficiaries, but eight were under the immediate patronage of this Board. These men were to have received \$40 and his tuition money each session, but for the want of funds many were paid only in part, due chiefly it would seem from a lack of confidence in the students receiving aid and to the plans of the Board of Education. In 1833 a committee was appointed to examine the rules and regulations of the Board,¹⁸ and to make the necessary suggestions and improvements. The utterances of this committee are very elaborate and searching. Provision is made for an examining committee, including the professor of the Theological Seminary and the principal of the Classical Institution, for a financial committee, to whom each student rendered a satisfactory account of the manner in which the previous apportionment had been expended, for a permanent fund consisting of donations and bequests appropriated for the purpose, and for scholarships when they are provided by bequests. Each beneficiary was to refund without interest as soon as possible

¹⁷ See Min. of Syn., 1829, p. 19.

¹⁸ See Min. of Syn., 1834, p. 49.

all moneys received, and when any of them abandoned the gospel ministry or connected himself with another denomination he was expected to refund immediately with interest. The committee recommended further that every classis in the German Reformed Church form itself into an auxiliary society. A goodly number of classes followed this suggestion. In 1832 Maryland Classis is reported to be sustaining six students. North Carolina Classis' organization is recognized in 1834, East Pennsylvania Classis in 1835 and in 1838 when the Board of Education supported but eight students, the board of Maryland Classis assisted seven others. The minutes of Synod for that year reports also notes the fact that the board of trustees of the College "determined very liberally to give twenty-five beneficiaries free tuition."¹⁹

All the while the Board of Education was struggling with a debt and complained constantly of the lack of gifts for this cause, and as but half of the year's obligations were met in 1841 it was "*Resolved*, that in obtaining Centenary contributions for Beneficiary Education those sums under five dollars not given for permanent investment, may be applied to meet the current expenses of the Board," also, "*Resolved*, That it be recommended to each of our pastoral charges to assume the education of one or more particular indigent young man, for the ministry."²⁰

That the fathers of the church were zealous for the high standing of the ministry is evidenced by a recommendation to refuse admission to the Seminary to all students who had not proceeded as far as the sophomore year in the College course, or done an equivalent amount of work.

In the fall of 1842 Dr. John W. Nevin wrote a series of articles for *The Reformed Church Messenger* (which see, September 7-October 5, 1842), which might with profit be reprinted for our time. A few quotations must suffice here. He says: "The demand for ministers is not changed because some ministers are idle. . . .

¹⁹ See Min. of Syn., 1838, p. 35.

²⁰ See Min. of Syn., 1841, p. 42.

"It ought not be taken for granted that candidates for the ministry, of the right stamp, and in sufficient number, will arise, simply because arrangements have been made, by which they are invited to come forward. Without much prayer on the part of the Church, and special pains bestowed on the case, it will not after all be rightly met. . . .

"All denominations found it necessary to use the beneficiary system. At the same time it should never be forgotten that the necessity for the beneficiary system, as it is now established in the different branches of the Church, lies in the defective character of the Church itself. A healthful, vigorous spiritual life would provide for the whole case in a different way. . . . They (the candidates) should be the direct spontaneous product of the general piety of the Church. . . . Ministers cannot come from without, they are the outgrowth of the Church. . . ."

He warns us not to leave the system, and calls attention to the demand for such as can officiate in German.

"It would be well to stand rigidly by the rule, that no one should be received as a beneficiary on the funds of the Education Society, without having previously been tried as a student at least six months. . . . It is not fair that this (beneficiary aid) should ever be employed, simply to assist a young man in finding out whether he has a mind that will allow an education, and a heart to carry him through the process.

"Of what avail will any system of theological training be, established under the authority of the Synod, if individual ministers encourage young men to *generalize* the studies of three years into one, and Classis can be persuaded to crown the labor saving process with a commission to go forth and preach. . . . Unfortunately too the young men who are the most likely to suffer by counsel of this sort, are those precisely on whom it is most likely to take effect."

The chronic indebtedness of the Board of Education has been noted. By 1844 matters had come to such a pass that after a circular on the subject by Dr. Nevin had been sent to

every classis, but ten dollars could be paid on each apportionment of forty dollars, and individual members of the board were borrowing on their private accounts to do even this amount. The board then suggested that Synod consider the advisability of dissolving the board, and a committee was created to investigate the case, but of course the Board was not dissolved.²¹

The year 1844 saw two other suggestions of interest. The Board of Education bargained with the board of trustees of the College to pay them \$800 annually for the privilege of having a number of young men educated, not exceeding forty in number.

The report for that year shows thirty-two men under the board and about ten others supported by classical boards and private individuals, yet many worthy applicants had to be refused aid because of the lack of funds.

The conduct of the men is reported to have been highly commendable, and adds this fitting suggestion: "It should be borne in mind by the private members of the Church, that if the ministers of the word, need the prayers of God's people, much more do those who are *preparing* to be laborers in his vineyard."²²

That sufficient funds might be available for the enlarged work of these years, all possible sources were appealed to. Former beneficiaries were asked for outstanding dues, but with little success, and the whole outlook was most distressing, especially so because so many congregations and classes seemed to have no sense of moral responsibility for the indebtedness of the several Boards.²³ To help the Church see its own indifferent attitude to the whole educational work, seems to have been one of the chief motives prompting Dr. Nevin to resign his chair of theology in 1851.

The report of the committee in 1853 sounds very modern. "Your committee lament the small number of Theological

²¹ Min. of Syn., 1844, p. 41.

²² Min. of Syn., 1844, p. 41.

²³ Min. of Syn., 1850, p. 39.

Students and in view of this fact, propose the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the Professors in Franklin and Marshall College and the ministers in the Church, be requested to exert themselves in seeking out pious young men, as candidates for the ministerial office; and *further* that it be earnestly enjoined upon our ministers to preach a sermon on this subject in each of their congregations, and that a committee be appointed to prepare papers for publication in our Church periodicals bearing on this point." The Revs. Frederick A. Rupley, Benjamin Bausman and Elder John Paul were the committee.²⁴

Another plan for meeting the needs of the beneficiary students was started in Susquehanna Classis in 1854. It recommended that Synod be requested, "to obtain, either by grant or purchase from the trustees of the College at Lancaster, a piece of ground, and to erect a building on it in which our Beneficiaries could be boarded in common, by which means much expense, it is thought, would be saved to the Church and to the young men." Synod appointed a committee with the Rev. Henry Harbaugh as chairman, to devise plans to secure the money, purchase the land and erect the building as soon as the means shall be obtained.²⁵ This project was discussed very fully on the floor of Synod, and the name "Marshall Hall" was given to the proposed building. Funds were sought after, the trustees of the College appropriated two acres of land for the purpose and the cause progressed nicely until 1858 when owing to the financial embarrassment of the country the committee suggested the indefinite postponement of this enterprise, and for a period of years, Marshall Hall was forgotten.

Meanwhile conditions demanding more ministers continued to exist. In 1856 the board of visitors of the Seminary reported "that scarcely a week passes in which there are not applications to the young men to settle as Pastors, and also

²⁴ Min. of Syn., 1853, p. 47.

²⁵ Min. of Syn., 1854, p. 32.

that the Classes report an unusually large number of promising young men, who are willing to devote themselves to the work of the ministry provided the necessary means will be furnished them."²⁶

The following changes were voted in 1859: That the debt of a certain class of beneficiaries were to be canceled and because of the great difficulty of keeping in touch with the beneficiaries in Academy and College since the removal to Lancaster, a special Board of Education with its seat in Lancaster be created.²⁷ To meet this condition the committee on theological seminary suggested a committee of their own number to see to this work in connection with the college faculty and suggested the advisability of having all the institutions in one place.²⁸

A strange wealth of men appears in 1862 when national events would suggest the contrary. The board of visitors of the Seminary "at the recommendation of the theological faculty suggest to Synod, whether some arrangement could not be made with the Board of Missions, or in some other way, by which fields of labor can be found for the young brethren who enter the ministry from the Seminary."²⁹

Synodic action from this time forth has to do for the most part with methods of work. With the coming into existence of the Pittsburgh Synod and the Synod of the Potomac, it would naturally be supposed that after the pattern of the original synod the three would have their respective members of the board of visitors of the Seminary be the Board of Education. This was done by the eastern synod, but not by the others.

Nor is this the only irregularity. In 1887 the Board of Education of the Eastern Synod has but two of the classes within its bounds making use of the board, the others doing this work directly. By 1905 five were using it.

The most helpful one piece of work in bringing to light the

²⁶ Min. of Syn., 1856, p. 39.

²⁷ Min. of Syn., 1859, p. 44.

²⁸ Min. of Syn., 1859, p. 50.

²⁹ Min. of Syn., 1862, p. 68.

activities of this board was done by the Secretary, the Rev. William F. Lichliter, in 1897 when he collected and issued The Actions of Synod from 1827-1897 and By-laws of the Board of Education.

Some surprising facts were brought to light by this research. More than 300 beneficiaries had received aid, 128 of whom, aided to the extent of \$31,560.30, had died, 67, receiving \$29,170.33, had been excused from making a refund by virtue of the fact that they had served in the ministry for ten years, while of the 10 others, some intend to refund. With more than three hundred having received aid from this board alone before 1897, the total number of those who have received help from all sources in our Church must be not less than twice that number.

The only large recorded gift made to this cause was given in 1873 and is called the John Henry Smaltz fund. An amount of \$5,000, the gift of Mrs. Smaltz in memory of her husband, the income to be devoted to students in the Seminary "who are willing to spend the first three years, at least, of their ministry in preaching the gospel of the Son of God, to the destitute in our own or in foreign lands."

BALTIMORE, MD.

(Continued.)

VIII.

CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY.

A. V. HIESTER.

Economic equality is the corner-stone of the social edifice outlined in *Looking Backward*; and once attained, every other form of equality, and, indeed, every other good, social and individual, follows as a matter of course. Like all material goods the means of culture are equally within reach of all. All have the same educational opportunities to the age of twenty or twenty-one, at which time they are drafted into the industrial army. No distinction is made between the higher and the more elementary forms of education. The former are just as free as the latter, for they cost no more to provide inasmuch as all grades of teachers, like all other workers, receive the same support.

The educational system rests on three grounds: first, the right of every man to the completest education the nation can give him, on his own account, as necessary to his enjoyment of himself; secondly, the right of his fellow citizens to have him educated, as necessary to their enjoyment of his society; and thirdly, the right of the unborn to be guaranteed an intelligent and refined parentage.

Besides schools of all kinds libraries, museums and art galleries are provided with a liberal hand. For those who appreciate music a varied program is provided for every hour of the day and night by music halls properly adapted to the different kinds of music. These halls are connected by telephone with the homes of all who care to pay the nominal charge which is made for the service. Much attention is given to the care of the body, and the result has been a marked improvement in the physical standard of the nation.

With the universalization of education, physical, mental and moral, and the establishment of economic equality, insanity, idiocy, suicide, vice and crime have been practically eliminated, either directly or through an improved heredity. Crime especially is largely the product of unjust economic conditions, which debauch the rich with idleness of body and mind, and sap the vitality of the poor by overwork, bad food and unsanitary homes. Just as soon as want is abolished, so the utopist argues, and the accumulation of riches is made impossible, crime becomes motiveless, except such forms of it as have their genesis in ignorance and bestiality; and the great majority of these are effectively reached by education. Should crime appear, as it does on rare occasions, it is regarded as an atavistic phenomenon and so treated. If the accused declines to plead guilty he is tried by three judges, one of whom presides while the other two state the two sides of the case somewhat after the fashion of prosecuting and defending attorneys. In order to a conviction the three judges, who serve alternately on the bench and at the bar, must agree on the verdict. If they fail to do so another trial must be had. Thus there are neither juries nor lawyers properly speaking, only judges.

The judiciary is partly appointive and partly elective; but in either case it is effectually safeguarded against direct popular control. The inferior judges are appointed by the President from those who have reached the age of forty-five, and serve five years without reëligibility. The superior judges are chosen by the vote of those inferior judges, whose terms are about to expire and who are themselves ineligible to the higher office, from those that are eligible. Both classes are exceptions to the rule of retirement at forty-five.

Besides the control of industry there is little for the government to do; and what it does in the field of industry is almost entirely administrative in character. For there can be little need for legislation where there are no rights of private property to be defined and protected. That there may be no excess of legislation Congress meets only quinquennially; and as a

further safeguard against hasty and ill-considered legislation it is provided that a particular Congress may enact only such laws as have been proposed to it by its immediate predecessor.

Unlike most American socialists, who hold that socialism would not seriously interfere with our federal system of government, *Looking Backward* frankly admits the necessity of abolishing the state governments in order to a central and uniform regulation of industry. The municipal governments, on the other hand, are not only retained, but invested with a considerable measure of autonomy, particularly in such matters as public comfort and recreation. In order that a municipality may make proper provision for its own improvement and embellishment it is permitted to retain a certain proportion of the quota of labor contributed by its citizens to the nation. This proportion is regarded as so much credit and may be expended as each municipality sees fit.

One of the cardinal objections to modern socialism is the fear that to put the control of all industry in the hands of the government would seriously impair, if not destroy, the principle of individual liberty. But in *Looking Backward* this fear is made to appear entirely groundless. There is no interference with freedom of speech, or of the press, or of conscience. While the government does not publish at the common expense all that is brought to it, it does not, on the other hand, print only what it approves. If an author is willing to defray the cost of the printing out of his credit he can have anything printed. This cost is so moderate that to publish a book of average size need not seriously tax an adult's yearly credit. When a book is published in this way it is placed on sale in the public stores at a price determined by the cost of publication plus a royalty for the author. This royalty is whatever the author chooses to make it. He will know of course that its amount will largely determine the sale of the book. Hence it is to his interest, if he is ambitious for a literary career, to be satisfied with a moderate royalty, since it is only for so long a time as his royalties suffice to support

him that he is released from other service. It is, therefore, an author's literary ability as measured by public opinion which alone determines to what extent he may devote his time to literature.

A somewhat similar course is followed in the case of periodical literature. When a newspaper or magazine is to be started the first step is to secure a sufficient number of subscriptions to defray the cost of the printing and indemnify the nation for permitting the editor to be taken away from the general service; and when his services are no longer satisfactory to the subscribers, who have the sole power of election and removal, he forthwith resumes his place in the industrial army.

With varying details the same general principle holds in other fields of original genius, such as music, painting, sculpture, invention or design. In art public opinion is even more controlling than in literature. For the people vote directly on the question of accepting or rejecting statues and paintings for the embellishment of the public buildings, the only market practically for the products of brush and chisel; and if the verdict is favorable the artist is released from other service in order that he may devote himself entirely to his particular art. A free field is thus offered to all aspirants. The consequence is that exceptional talent is readily discovered; and once discovered, it is afforded every opportunity for its exercise and development.

Religion is so free that there is not the slightest semblance of a national church or an official body of clergymen. Any number of persons may associate for religious purposes, rent from the government a suitable room or building by means of their individual credits, and secure the services of a teacher or minister by subscribing out of their annual credits, as in the case of newspaper editors, an amount sufficient to indemnify the nation against the loss of his services in general industry. While people may still go to church in the old way, sermons

are ordinarily delivered in acoustically prepared chambers connected by wire with subscribers' houses.

A similar freedom prevails in the field of industry. With respect to the phenomena of supply and demand the individual is not compelled to consume only what the government is willing to produce, as is commonly supposed by opponents of socialism, but the government is required to produce what the individual consumer demands. In short, production is adjusted to consumption, not consumption to production. The estimates of the probable demand for the various commodities are made up by the distributing department. After being approved by the central administration these estimates are transmitted to the ten great departments, which cover the field of productive industry, and which apportion their shares of the total estimates among their component bureaus. The latter then set the laborers to work. It is clearly beyond the power of the central administration to stop the production of a commodity for which there continues to be a demand however small. It may happen of course that owing to a decreased demand for a particular commodity the cost of producing it may be materially enhanced. In such a case the government will raise the price to the consumer. But as long as there are those who are willing to pay the increased price production must go on. For the production of a new commodity it is necessary merely to guarantee a certain demand. The government in industry as in other concerns is only the agent of the people.

In nothing perhaps does the new order of things exhibit so marked a departure from the old as in the status of women. Whether married or unmarried they are members of the industrial army like men. They receive the same wages in proportion to the time they labor. Their period of service, too, is the same unless interrupted by maternal duties. On the other hand, the work which they do is adapted to their sex and strength. Their hours of labor are shorter. Their vacations are longer and more frequent. Because of these differences

they may be said to constitute an allied force rather than an integral part of the army of men. At the head of this allied force is a woman general-in-chief who with the higher officers is elected by the body of women who have passed their period of service. She has a seat in the President's cabinet and a veto on all measures relating to women's work pending an appeal to Congress. There are also women judges, appointed by the general-in-chief for women, for the trial of causes in which one or both parties are women. When the latter is the case the board of judges is composed exclusively of women. In the former case the trial must be before a mixed court.

A most important effect of the economic independence of women, particularly when reënforced by the principle of the economic equality of all, is that marriages are entered into for love and not for convenience. Under the operation of these two principles there is neither wealth nor rank to dazzle the one or the other party, and divest the attention from personal qualities which should constitute the sole basis of marriage.

Children are no more supported by their parents than wives by their husbands. Men, women and children are alike maintained out of the common stock. The only differences are that women receive on the average less than men, for the reason that their period of service is more liable to be interrupted, and that a child's share is much smaller than that of an adult. But whatever the allowance of a child may be it comes in each case, not from or through the parents, but directly from the government, which maintains a separate account for every person irrespective of age or sex.

Equality, the other social romance from the pen of Mr. Bellamy, appeared in 1897, nine years after the publication of *Looking Backward* to which it bears a two-fold relation. It is, first, a philosophic background to the ideal state which is somewhat roughly sketched in *Looking Backward*; and secondly, it completes that picture by refining and elaborating certain of its features and adding some new ones which were omitted from the earlier work.

The new social order and the revolution by which it came to be established are regarded by our utopist as but the visible evidences of a new and higher stage in the evolution of democracy; and for him the word democracy connotes both an economic and a political fact. Thus understood democracy has two main phases. In its negative and earlier phase it is merely a device for getting rid of kings. It is a change only in the forms of government, not in its principles and purposes. The positive phase of democracy, on the other hand, means, not merely a transfer of power from kings and nobles to the people, but the employment of that power in the interest of the common good. It means in short a revolution in the whole idea of government, its motives, purposes and functions. It is grounded on the worth and dignity of the individual which is essentially the same in all individuals. Hence equality is the basic principle of positive democracy. But it is an equality that is more than political. Until there is an economic solidarity by which the common and individual interests are identified, so that no one can hurt another's interest without hurting his own or promote his own without promoting equally all other interests, neither a high degree of material well-being nor a wise and stable government are possible. But the only way of accomplishing such an economic solidarity is to give to each citizen an equal share in the undivided capital of the nation.

The basis of political equality, economic equality is itself rooted in the most fundamental of all rights, the right to live. But to safeguard this right it is not enough for the state to protect its citizens against the assassin; it must protect them also against hunger and cold which constitute a far more deadly and constant foe to human existence than violence and poison. But the right of the individual to his life is not properly protected on the economic side by a bare subsistence, or by anything less than the fullest satisfaction of every legitimate need which it is in the power of the state to provide for all. Now the things which men must consume in order to

live are limited in quantity. It is evident, therefore, that if one succeeds in securing for his own use more than his equal share of these things the rest will not have enough. If then the first right of the citizen is the right to live, and if the first duty of the state is to safeguard that right, the state must see to it as its most fundamental obligation that the means of life are not monopolized by the few but distributed so as to meet the needs of all. Having assumed this obligation the state can fulfil it in no other way than in accordance with the principle of "equality before the law," which means that in so far as the state undertakes any social function it must act absolutely without respect to persons for the equal benefit of all. But the state must do even more than this. It must not only distribute equally among its citizens the wealth of the nation available for consumption, but it must also employ the national resources wisely and economically in the production of more wealth, in order that a continuous supply of necessities, comforts and luxuries may be provided.

Next to the right to live the most fundamental of human rights is the right to liberty. For the proper protection of this right it is not enough, again, that the state safeguard its citizens from chattel slavery, peonage and unjust imprisonment. It must also safeguard them against those economic influences, which are the necessary consequences of inequalities of wealth, and which force men through want to buy their lives by the surrender of their liberties, to become, in short, the serfs of the rich in order to obtain the means of subsistence.

Economic equality finds still another justification in certain ethical considerations. According to this argument the chief cause of the great industrial superiority of civilized peoples is to be found in their superior social organism. The efficiency of this organism is measured by the difference between what one man can produce in association with others and what he can produce as an isolated laborer. Now the social organism not only multiplies the productive capacity of labor many times, but it also minimizes the industrial importance of per-

sonal differences between individual laborers. A difference between two laborers of two to one is important. But when it is combined with a factor—the social organism—equal to one hundred it becomes a difference of 102 to 101 which is negligible. The social organism belongs to no one in particular. It is the indivisible inheritance of all, and, therefore, the proportion of the annual production of wealth which is referable to it, and nearly all can be so referred, belongs to all equally.

Let us leave now these philosophical disquisitions, to which a considerable part of the book is devoted, in order to note yet some of the more important practical implications of the principle of economic equality.

To this principle is to be ascribed first of all the complete transformation of the relations between the sexes. It is obvious that where men have become equal in material well-being the use of gold and silver and precious stones is meaningless, since they can no longer serve as symbols of wealth and means of social ostentation. The same principle holds with respect to dress generally. Because of the economic independence of women with respect to men there is no more need for women than for men to make themselves desirable to the other sex by means of jewels and fine clothes. It is no longer the case as it once was that a woman's face is her fortune, and that a man, because his economic position outweighs matters of personal advantage or disadvantage in commending him to the other sex, can be indifferent as to dress and personal qualities. The effect then of the principle of economic equality has been to make women less and men more attentive to dress, the two being in this respect precisely on the same plane.

This relation of perfect equality continues after marriage. The wife is no more subject to her husband than he is to her. She does not even take his name but retains her own. Her daughters take her name as a last name and their father's as a middle name, while the sons do just the reverse.

Economic equality has universalized education. This does

not mean merely that the schools from the kindergarten to the university are open to all on equal terms. Education is regarded as a life process. To pass through the schools is only to acquire that necessary minimum of education which the state requires of all as a preparation for citizenship. Graduation from the schools means no more than that this minimum has been attained, and that the point has been reached where the individual is presumed to be competent and is given the right to prosecute his further education without the guidance or compulsion of the state. For the benefit then of those who have completed the curricula of the schools elective post-graduate courses are provided in every branch of science, which are free to all and which may be prosecuted as each one sees fit, continuously or intermittently, strenuously or leisurely, profoundly or superficially. Many keep up their studies to old age, and frequently the most enthusiastic and diligent students are those in middle life, whose release from industrial service at forty-five insures them abundant leisure for study, as well as that serenity of mind which is incompatible with material cares and responsibilities.

Less technical forms of education are provided by the opera, the theatre, the music hall, the platform, the pulpit, all of which are free or practically so. Through the perfection of the telephone and the electroscope, the latter a device for seeing at a distance as the telephone is for hearing, these cultural agencies wherever they may be located can be utilized in the privacy of one's home thousands of miles away. The consequence is that mediocrity is effectually suppressed, since only the best thinkers, orators and artists will be in demand when they can be heard and seen just as easily as lesser ones. This is particularly the case with respect to the pulpit. Instead of an army of preachers preaching every Sunday to as many congregations in as many churches a few master minds speak to millions at a time. This is putting in the hands of a few a power and authority far greater than any ever wielded by pope or emperor. It is the creation of an intellectual aristoc-

racy in the midst of an industrial democracy, an aristocracy, however, whose supremacy continues only so long as its power is wisely and unselfishly exercised.

The effect of this supersession of church attendance as a means of instruction has been to emphasize the moral and intellectual elements in religion at the expense of its ritual and ceremonial side. The growth of universal intelligence has tended in the same direction. Lest such radical changes might be thought to spell the decline of religion our utopist hastens to assure us that such has not been the case. Sec-tarianism has declined and must inevitably do so where ceremonialism has lost its power and where each one selects his preacher on personal grounds. But religion far from declining has in reality gained in moral and spiritual power. "There is a more rational conception of religion," we are informed, "owing to greater intelligence, complete intellectual freedom in its study, and freedom from material engrossments. It is recognized that after a century of economic progress the race has reached the goal of its evolution. While the production of wealth has increased, there has been developed a simplicity of taste, which, by rejecting excess and surfeit, needs less and less of the material side of life and more of the mental and moral."

That the influence of intellectual and moral genius may not be limited by national boundaries a universal language has been devised, which every one learns to speak in addition to his national tongue, and by means of which the master minds may address persons simultaneously in all parts of the world. The advantages of this universal language have become so manifest that the smaller nations have entirely abandoned their national tongues. It is only among the greater nations, the nations that have fine literatures embalmed in their tongues, that the bilingual condition has persisted. The effect of the establishment of a universal language and a just social order has been to bind the nations together in an intellectual and moral world order, and by eliminating the various incentives to

conflict between man and man, between class and class and between nation and nation, to usher in the reign of universal peace.

Economic equality has transformed the physical side of human existence no less than the spiritual. The masses are no longer underfed and overworked as they once were. Improved conditions of living and housing, systematic and universal physical culture, the elimination of the social evil through the economic independence of women, advances in medical and sanitary science, a higher general intelligence, and a better physical inheritance to begin with, have greatly limited both the intensity and the frequency of disease. The great progress in sanitary science is particularly evident in such matters as clothing and housefurnishing. All clothing of both sexes, for they dress practically alike, is made of paper or some cheap fibre—the heroine of the story pays only twenty cents for her best gowns; and when soiled, instead of being washed it is thrown away or returned to the mills to be made into something else. Woolen, cotton, silk and linen garments are unknown. Carpets, hangings, bedding, hats, shoes, kettles, dishes and crockery, are made of the same materials as clothing, and when they become soiled they are similarly disposed of. Shoes are seamless. The soles are treated with solutions which make them as hard as iron without interfering with their lightness, while the uppers of those designed for wet weather are also coated on the outside with a lacquer impervious to moisture. The changes in clothing and housefurnishings, we are told, have done more than all other improvements combined to eradicate contagious and other diseases and relegate plagues and epidemics to ancient history.

To the foregoing factors in the physical improvement of the race must be added yet another, namely, the abandonment of a meat diet by which human beings formerly inherited the diseases of the animals they ate. This change was not however wholly in the interest of physical health and well-being. It sprang also from certain moral considerations, from the

passion of pity and sympathy with all suffering, which, if given free play, must transform not merely the relations of men to their fellows but also their relations to the whole world of sentient being. Under the influence of these ever widening sentiments man has come to regard himself as merely an elder brother in the *great family of nature charged with the care and protection of the lower orders of being*, which formerly he ruthlessly sacrificed to his own comfort and pleasure.

Coincidentally with this change of sentiment with respect to meat the women began to demand a wider life. The immediate consequence of this demand was that the business of providing and preparing food was made a branch of the public service, which materially hastened the transition from a meat to a vegetable diet. If the work of preparing food had continued as an isolated household industry carried on mainly by women and servants, the most conservative and habit-bound classes of persons, it would have been a difficult matter to find a satisfactory substitute for meat. But in the hands of the government the resources of botany, chemistry and other branches of science were freely drawn upon in the effort to find new food materials as well as new methods of preparation. In both respects the quest was eminently successful. It was found that only a small proportion of the natural products capable of being used for food by man had ever been utilized, only those in fact which readily lent themselves to the primitive method of cooking by dry or wet heat. The utilization of the others has been made possible by the discovery of new processes of cooking through the art of the chemist.

Economic equality has solved the problem of the city, one of the knottiest problems with which the nineteenth century had to grapple. The big city with all its evil conditions was clearly the child of private capitalism. In the absence of a nationalized system of industry producers and consumers seeking their own interests were inevitably brought together in haphazard fashion. Buyers and sellers gravitated to the best

markets. Manufacturers located where there were large bodies of consumers as well as adequate supplies of labor. Thus the cities became centers of industry and commerce. This led to the concentration of wealth, and the concentration of wealth led to the concentration of all the refined, the pleasant and the luxurious ministrations of life, all of which attracted the professional and learned classes, also courtesans, thieves and gamblers.

But with the establishment of economic equality the city lost its supposed advantages over the country. It ceased to be a center of commerce, for the simple reason that a nationalized system of industry leaves no room for markets and middlemen and private profits. It no longer afforded greater economic opportunities, since the obligation of the state to employ and maintain all on equal terms is not affected by geographical considerations. It ceased to be a place where greater luxury could be enjoyed or displayed, because wealth confers no distinction where all are economically equal, and because the quality and value of the goods and services furnished by the government is everywhere the same. It lost its monopoly of education, culture and the refinements of life, for by means of the telephone and electroscope the rural dwellers may enjoy the theatre, the opera, the public lecture on equal terms with the residents of the largest cities. The consequence of all this has been that the cities have not only ceased to grow but have greatly declined in population, to the manifest advantage of both city and country. In the city the unsightly skyscrapers and tenements have given way to broad, low, roomy structures. Parks, gardens and open spaces have been multiplied. Dustless and noiseless systems of transit have been installed. And in general the living conditions have been vastly improved.

The country has witnessed an even greater transformation of the conditions of existence. Under the direction of the government agriculture has had the benefit of every scientific discovery and achievement. Machinery and electricity have

completely superseded horses and hand labor, so that even the smallest tool is moved by electricity the worker having no more to do than adjust and guide it. This has not only made farm labor much more productive than formerly, but it has made farming a more attractive occupation. In fact, owing to the elimination, through improved means of communication and transportation, of that isolation and lack of social intercourse which formerly attached to farm life, farming has come to be regarded as one of the most desirable of all occupations. And if the farmer desires larger opportunities for social intercourse during his leisure hours than those afforded by the telephone, the electroscope, the railway, and the air ship, he can live in the city and be carried to and fro between his residence and place of occupation with little loss of time.

It is most evident that where all industry is in the hands of the government and nothing is left to individual enterprise the quality of that government will be a consideration of the first importance. While the chief reliance, in the ideal state portrayed in *Looking Backward* and *Equality*, is placed on the improved individual character, which has resulted from the establishment of economic equality, the mechanism of government has not been overlooked. That the government may be responsive to the popular will the referendum, initiative and recall are provided for, although their practical operation is not explained. The probable reason for this is that these devices are felt to be altogether unnecessary since owing to the principle of economic equality there is neither motive nor opportunity for venality. Opportunities for venality abound only where men are unequal in material well-being, and where the private economic interest of the citizen is constantly pitted against the common interest. And on the other hand, because the only possible object that men can have in accepting public office is to deserve the public esteem, against which all-dominant consideration every other is powerless, there can be no motive for venality.

The efficiency of a nationalized system of industry is a

much-mooted point among social economists. Mr. Bellamy is on that point as on so many others a pronounced optimist. Despite the very limited period of industrial service required of each citizen in his ideal state, he assures us that all are maintained in comfort and luxury. This is in part owing to the intelligence and efficiency of the government and its freedom from venality. But much more is due to the elimination of those wastes which are inseparable from an individualistic competitive system of industry. These are mainly: wastes from mistaken industries; wastes from the cut-throat competition of those engaged in industry; wastes by periodical gluts and crises and the consequent interruptions of industry; wastes from unemployed labor and capital at all times; wastes from military and naval expenditures; wastes from the maintenance of revenue systems, state and national, and their armies of employees and officials; wastes from commercial and financial systems with their markets and middlemen; wastes from crime and pauperism. It is estimated that after due allowance has been made for these various factors the share of each adult working full time is something like four thousand dollars, not in the form of money of course, for there is no money, but in the form of credits or orders for goods and services. But even this generous amount, which is at least six times the present average adult income in the United States, does not fairly represent the economic possibilities of the system. It is the policy of the government to keep well in advance of the nation's consumption of staple and imperishable commodities by maintaining surpluses of these goods which are added to each year, in order to safeguard the nation against a season or two of poor crops, as well as against a sudden and unexpected increase of population by immigration. What makes this large average income still more remarkable is the fact that the purchasing power of a dollar is at least fifty per cent. higher than it was when the new social order was established, and the further fact that the four thousand dollars is a net income for the individual from which the government

subtracts nothing for taxes. On the contrary, it adds a considerable amount to it by providing free or practically so such important services as water, light, music, news, the theatre, the opera, postal and telephonic communication, possibly also railway, water and aerial transportation, all of which under the old order of things had to be paid for out of private incomes. The reason why not all goods and services are provided in the same way is to give free play to the greatest possible variety of tastes in expenditure. Equality is esteemed a good thing but monotony is not.

The scheme of social regeneration outlined in *Looking Backward* and *Equality* holds a unique place among the world's utopias. While it never reached the experimental stage as some did, it inspired as no other did a vigorous and wide-spread though short-lived propaganda for the education of the world up to its principles. In the United States it led to a distinct political movement known as nationalism, the purpose of which was to realize by actual experiment, after a period devoted to education, the principles of the socialization of industry and the brotherhood of man. At first *Looking Backward* was generally regarded as nothing more than a romance. But from the first there were those who saw in it a deliberate statement of a practicable social order. This view was altogether in harmony with that of the author, whose efforts to subordinate romantic interest to philanthropic purpose are quite evident in *Looking Backward* and still more so in *Equality*. He intended the story to be a more or less exact forecast of the next stage of social and industrial evolution, particularly in the United States. He believed moreover that this stage was near at hand, that it would consume little time in realizing itself, and that there was an imperative and immediate need of preparing the masses for it. And so he threw himself body and soul into the nationalist movement to which he devoted the remainder of his life as editor, author and lecturer. The movement took from the first an educational rather than a political course. As a political force it accom-

plished practically nothing. As an organized propaganda it ran its course in a few years, not, however, without having prepared the way for other schemes of social betterment. For its early decline two things were mainly responsible: first, the fact that its membership was almost exclusively composed of the middle class; and secondly, the fact that its immediate program was largely appropriated by the Peoples Party and embodied in its national platform in 1892.

LANCASTER, PA.

IX.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE TENTH GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE ALLIANCE OF RE- FORMED CHURCHES HOLDING THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM.

It can hardly be said that the Aberdeen Council of the Alliance of Reformed Churches was a great council in the sense that it was epoch-making, or had any distinguishing features above other councils of the same kind. And yet it certainly was a notable council, notable because of the place of meeting, notable in the personnel of its delegates, notable on account of its programme, the important papers read, and the discussion of topics of vital interest by men who stand out as leaders in theological thought and in the great religious movements of the present day. The importance and value of such a meeting are to be found less in the direct results in the form of positive action or definite conclusions, than in the far-reaching effect upon the individual members and the constituent bodies in the way of a better understanding, a broader outlook, a deeper faith, a fuller consecration because of the personal touch, the face to face and heart to heart intermingling, discussion, and fellowship which the carrying out of the programme necessarily requires. To bring about such results all the conditions were favorable in the highest degree, and, accordingly, the council may be regarded as of no mean significance in the great movement toward closer union among the constituent members of the body of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Aberdeen, the "Granite City" or the "Silver City by the Sea," has an imposing appearance of solidity if not splendor. It is almost built of granite, and when the sun shines upon it after a rainstorm, it stands out in wonderful brightness and beauty. It is an important industrial center, and the seat of

a University that takes high rank among the universities of Scotland. Formed of King's College in the old city and Marischal College in the new, with its magnificent building that cost about \$500,000, it has about 800 students and is a fitting combination of the old and the new in education. The churches, too, are large and numerous. The city was well fitted, therefore, to receive and entertain the Council, and the good people of Aberdeen did their part grandly, not only in the way of entertaining the delegates, but also in providing for those social features which made room for the close personal touch of acquaintance and fellowship with men whom it was worth while to meet. After the opening services in the plain but dignified Cathedral, St. Machar Church, there was a reception by the Principal, Court, and Senators of the University at King's College, and in the evening of the same day, the delegates were received at the Art Gallery by the Lord Provost, the Magistrates, and Town Council of Aberdeen. On Thursday afternoon a garden party was given to the delegates by Sir David and Lady Stewart on their grounds at Banchory House, and on Saturday afternoon the delegates were taken on a grand excursion up the beautiful valley of the Dee to Ballalut, and thence by coach to Balmoral, the favorite summer residence of the English Royal Family, who attend the Presbyterian Church at Craigie during their stay at Balmoral. After a survey of the beautiful grounds and the royal castle, the delegates repaired to the Church, where a short service was held, and then to the manse, where, on the spacious grounds, refreshments were served and a number of entertaining speeches were made. This excursion in the Highlands with the beautiful scenery on every side and Lochnagar, the highest peak, towering above all with a crown of the winter's snow still on its brow, was a feature never to be forgotten, and it afforded still further opportunity for making acquaintance and enjoying social fellowship.

The programme was not only a good one in that it presented a series of topics of prime importance at the present day, but

also in making a suitable arrangement of the order of topics, and dividing them so that the subdivisions come in logical order. The opening sermon was delivered by the Very Rev. George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D., principal of Aberdeen University on the "Service and Mission of Presbyterianism." After the constituting of the Council, the President, the Rev. David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D., of New York, delivered the President's Address. The first topic for discussion on the second day, was *Authority in Matters of Faith*. (a) "The Authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ," by the Rev. Principal Scrimger, D.D., of Montreal. (b) "The Authority of the Scripture," by the Very Rev. Principal Alexander Stewart, D.D., of St. Andrews. (c) "The Authority of Christian Experience," by Rev. C. M. Steffens, D.D., of the Theological Seminary at Dubuque, Ia. In the afternoon the topic was *The Christian Church*. (a) "Notes of the Church," by Principal J. Iverach, D.D., of Aberdeen. (b) "The Nature and Limitation of its Authority," by the Rev. R. C. Reed, D.D., of the Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C. In the evening there were *Addresses on the Church*. (a) "The Church as a Witness for Christ," (b) "The Church and the Kingdom of God," (c) "The Church and the Brotherhood of Humanity." On the third day the topic was *Christology*, including (a) "The Deity of Our Lord Jesus Christ," by the Rev. Dr. Wallace Radcliffe, of Washington, D. C., (b) "The Cross and Present-Day Religion," by Rev. Prof. H. R. Mackintosh, D.D., of Edinburgh, and (c) "The Abiding Presence of Christ in the Church," by the Rev. John E. Bushnell, D.D., of Minneapolis, Minn. In the afternoon the topic was *Catechisms*. (a) "The Use of Catechisms," by Principal Williams, of Glasgow, (b) "The Heidelberg Catechism: Its 350th Anniversary," by Rev. Philip Vollmer, D.D., Theological Seminary, Dayton, O., (c) "The Westminster Catechism," by Rev. Prof. Henry Cowan, D.D., D.C.L., of Aberdeen. This was followed in the evening by the topic *Our Church System*. This reference to the detailed arrangement of the first part

of the programme may suffice to give an idea of the general plan. There were, in the nature of the case, important reports on the work of the Alliance, by Dr. Mathews from the Eastern Section and by Dr. J. I. Good from the Western Section, papers and discussion on the youth of the Church, Sunday schools, and the consideration of missionary topics both home and foreign, with reports from missionaries fresh from their respective fields. But it would be tedious to follow out the programme in detail. It is sufficient to refer to some of the more prominent subjects that followed. On Monday the morning was given up to *Confessional Topics*, including (a) "History of the Formulating of Fundamental Articles of Faith," by Rev. Dr. D. S. Schaff, of the Theological Seminary at Allegheny, (b) "The Historical and Present-Day Value of Confessions of Faith," by Rev. Prof. Wm. S. Curtis, of Aberdeen, and (c) "Creed Revision," by Rev. S. J. Richolls, D.D., of St. Louis, Mo. Tuesday's programme was still more practical, the two topics treated being *The Ministry* and *The Congregation*. Under the first head there were papers on (a) "Ordination and its Significance," by Rev. Prof. W. M. Clow, D.D., of Glasgow, (b) "Methods of Theological Instruction," by Rev. Geo. B. Stewart, D.D., Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y., (c) "Need for Variety in Training," by Rev. Prof. George Milligan, D.D., of Glasgow. Under the second head there were four papers (a) "The Fellowship and Responsibility of Church Members," by Mr. Robert Whyte, London, (b) "The Value of Public Worship as a Means of Grace," by the Rev. Dr. Wm. C. Schaeffer, Theological Seminary, Lancaster, (c) "The Value of Public Worship as a Christian Testimony," by Mr. W. Rounsell Brown, Glasgow, (d) "The Mutual Relation of Minister and People," by Dr. Stone, of Chicago, Moderator of the General Assembly.

The papers and the discussions which followed them were, of course, not of equal value. Some did not rise above the level of mediocrity, whilst others were strong, clear-cut, and profound. The proceedings of the Council, when published,

will not only prove interesting, but they will also invite serious thought and profound study. Our own representatives on the programme, Drs. Vollmer and Schaeffer, made contributions of permanent value, and their papers were received with marked attention. Among the other papers that showed marked ability and left a deep impression may be mentioned the following: Principal Scrimger's paper on "The Authority of our Lord Jesus Christ," and the Very Rev. Stewart's on "The Authority of the Scriptures"; "The Cross and Present-Day Religion," by Prof. H. B. Mackintosh; "The Historical and Present-Day Value of Confessions of Faith," by Prof. William A. Curtis; "Ordination: Its History and Significance," by Rev. Prof. W. M. Clow; "Methods of Theological Instruction," by the Rev. Dr. Geo. W. Stewart; and, "Need for Variety in Training," by Rev. Prof. Geo. Milligan. There were other papers of great value, but, as has been said, these were the ones that made the deepest impression. The evening addresses were of a more popular character, and the meetings were held in some of the city churches. Aberdeen, however, did not seem fully awake at first to the significance of the Council, for the audiences were comparatively small. It needed Professor Stalker, of Aberdeen, and Dr. C. W. Gordon (Ralph Connor), of Winnipeg, to draw the crowd that filled the West United Free Church to overflowing on Monday evening.

The general temper and tone of the Council came out perhaps more fully in the discussions than in the papers which were read. And the first thing to be noticed was the spirit of freedom and progress which prevailed. There was indeed not a single instance in which any one manifested a disposition to depart seriously from any essential doctrine of the Christian faith; but with great unanimity growth and advancement in knowledge and doctrine were assumed, and the value and importance of critical scholarship were recognized. The only reactionary notes that were heard came from the American side. The president in his opening address charged

churches and theological seminaries with being responsible for the decadence of interest in religion by their looseness in doctrine and wandering into the unknown wilds of theological speculation. Later in discussing the training necessary for the ministry of the present day it was said that there was entirely too much apologetic teaching instead of a thorough grounding in the faith. As over against this statement, Dr. Iverach, and others, in no uncertain sounds, insisted that the young minister must be trained to understand the issues that will confront him, and that the Church must not ignore but meet the problems raised by the so-called liberal theology if her truth is to be triumphant.

On the whole, then, the Council was both helpful and reassuring. First, it gave evidence that the large body of representative men who stand out as leaders of theological thought have no sympathy with dead formalism or the fetters of narrow confessionalism. The spirit of free inquiry and progress is recognized as necessary to a healthy, virile apprehension of the verities of the faith once delivered to the saints. Secondly, it afforded just as strong assurance of loyalty to the fundamental articles of the old faith, asserting and maintaining the cardinal facts and doctrines without which Christianity would cease to be the religion of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, the Lord of life and glory. The trend of thought evidently is towards the realization of the motto: "In essential things unity; in unessential things liberty; in all things charity."

JOHN S. STAHR.

X.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE FIVE GREAT PHILOSOPHIES OF LIFE. By William DeWitt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages 281. Price \$1.50 net.

This book is an enlarged edition under a new title of the author's former volume *From Epicurus to Christ*. The part which treats of the Christian spirit of love as the final philosophy of life has been entirely rewritten in this new volume.

The purpose of the book is to present, interpret and compare the five great philosophical principles which sprang into existence in the centuries from the birth of Socrates to the death of Jesus, viz., the Epicurean pursuit of pleasure, the Stoic law of self-control, the Platonic principle of subordination of lower to higher, the Aristotelian sense of proportion and the Christian spirit of love. The author presents these principles in large part in the words of the great Masters and Founders themselves. These carefully selected quotations, together with the comments, interpretations, comparisons and practical applications of the several philosophical principles, make the book eminently worth while.

Dr. Hyde is not only an idealist in the best sense of the word, and a keen analyst who knows how to thrust his hand through non-essentials to the heart of a problem, but he is also intensely practical. He knows how to take the ancient philosophical systems and apply them to modern times. He knows where to look in our day and generation for the counterpart of the ancient Epicurean and Stoic, and he knows where to find the elements of surviving Platonism and Aristotelianism in the twentieth century.

In his chapter on the Epicurean system of thought, Dr. Hyde presents in a fascinating way the attractive elements in its view of work, play and happiness. He also shows with keen insight its grievous defects. He uses Tito Melema in George Eliot's *Romola* as a striking example of the shortcomings of Epicureanism. In his treatment of Stoicism he translates into simple everyday terms its underlying psychological doctrine, its reverence for universal law and its heroic attempt to solve the problem of evil. With sympathetic spirit he interprets the beautiful hymn of Cleanthes, the grandest expression of the Stoic religion. He shows the elements of permanent value in Stoicism, but gives the reasons too why we cannot rest on this cold and hard philosophy with its abstract universality, as the final guide to life.

He has a fine chapter on Platonism. He shows how vastly deeper and truer the Platonic principle of subordination of appetite to reason is to anything found in Stoicism or Epicureanism. Incidentally, Dr. Hyde's practical interpretation of Plato's scheme of education is one of the most suggestive things in this delightful chapter. The author in speaking of the truth and error of Platonism shows how the very antithesis which this philosophy makes between the higher and the lower in its greatest danger. He says that a great deal which passes for religion in our day is simply Neo-platonism masquerading in Christian dress.

Aristotle is sharply differentiated from the other ancient philosophies in characteristic fashion. Dr. Hyde says: "A man comes up for judgment. If Epicurus chances to be seated on the throne, he asks the candidate: 'Have you had a good time?' The Stoic asks him whether he has kept all the commandments, Plato asks him how well he has managed to keep under his appetites and passions. Aristotle's judgment-seat is a very different place. He asks: 'Have you had a worthy aim and have you used appropriate means to attain it?'" "It is the whole purpose of life expressed in doing that measures the worth of a man." The doctrine of the happy mean is also emphasized.

The crowning element of the volume is found in the chapter on the Christian spirit of love. It is a splendid modern interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. We have never seen a better application of the principles of Jesus to modern life in print anywhere. The closing pages show how Jesus' spirit of love absorbs into itself whatever is of real value in the systems of ancient philosophy. The Epicurean's joy is enhanced by the Christian spirit. The love of Christ is a deepened, sweetened, softened Stoicism. Christianity, as lofty as Platonism, gets its elevation by a different process. It lifts the lower and transforms it into the higher. So does Christianity gather up into itself whatever is good in Aristotle. Its devotion to a worthy end and the selection of efficient means are characteristic of the religion of love. Because Christianity is higher than the ancient philosophies, the Christian is not warranted in dispensing with them. Dr. Hyde makes a plea for the harmonious unity in the Christian life of the happy Epicurean disposition, the strong Stoic temper, the Platonic mood and the Aristotelian insight, all those crowned by the generous Christian spirit of love as the bond which binds them all together in the unity of personal life.

The book furnishes delightful and helpful reading. We take pleasure in commending it to the readers of the REVIEW. It moves on a high plane; it has breadth of vision; it discusses the deep and vital problems of life in a simple, direct and singularly helpful manner. Best of all it brings to the reader in a unique

way, by comparison and contrast, a realizing sense of the essential element in the Christian religion.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE NEW TESTAMENT PERIOD AND ITS LEADERS. By the Rev. Frank T. Lee, D.D. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. Cloth. Pages 360. Price \$1.35 net.

The work represented in this handsomely gotten-out volume has been well done by an author of large learning and competent ability for giving fine and attractive literary expression to it. The contents are divided into two parts. In the first, Dr. Lee undertakes a survey of the providential preparation which was made for Christianity among the Jewish people in particular and the Gentile nations in general. He discusses in a most satisfactory and illuminating way the historical, the political and the religious conditions the new faith had to meet, and the difficulties it encountered on every side. One chapter is devoted to the study of the contribution that was made by "the Forerunner" of Jesus for the "Inauguration" of Christianity by Him who "came forth from God" commissioned to perform this office. The chapter which deals with the "inauguration" furnishes a very satisfactory outline of the life and work of the Nazarene.

The second part of the book takes up the lives and services of the principal "leaders" in the history of the early development and spread of Christianity. Peter, John, Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, Paul, James, Silas, Apollos, Titus and Timothy are taken up in succession, their distinctive and characteristic services considered, and the extent and value of their respective labors and struggles set forth in a most lucid and instructive form. It may be doubted whether anywhere else such a mass of really important learning and information concerning these "leaders" has been brought together and made so readily available to students of the New Testament as is here put within easy reach. For sermonic help and for Sunday School instruction, one knows of no other work that can be more confidently recommended to young preachers or students of the Bible. In the pursuit of a definite practical aim, it leaves critical questions in the background, and thus, all the more successfully, lends itself to the better popular understanding of the origin and establishment of our Religion.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF THE ANGLO-SAXON RACE. By M. V. B. Knox. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. Cloth. Pages 536. Price \$2.00 net.

More than ten years of time has been given by this well-known author to the historic research which is in evidence in this exceptionally interesting and informing treatise on the important subject which it discusses. Dr. Knox has studied the original sources and documents of the Anglo-Saxons and accordingly offers author-

itative and trustworthy data for the study of the secret forces which lie back of the religious life of the mighty and successful English-speaking race. Restricting himself carefully to the subject in hand, our author has written not another book of church history, but a series of chapters which deal with the secret forces that have been constantly present and vitally active in the various fields of modern civilization,—forces not always distinctly referable to church beliefs, but, nevertheless, potent factors in the elevation of racial elevation and religious progress. In this broad outlook reside the particular value and engaging charm of these luminous pages. One can have but little taste for or interest in Christian history, if he will not be interestedly carried along by the writer from start to finish through these chapters.

Dr. Knox possesses many of the prime requisites of a present-day historian,—talent for original investigation, balance of judgment for weighing the value of conflicting statements, courage for pointing out the direction into which truth requires us to follow, and rare power for interpreting the significance of facts and giving them adequate literary expression. All these qualifications are laid under tribute by him in the production of this inspiring and truly helpful volume, every paragraph of whose chapters is a mine of wealth for historic inquirers. The excellent index to the contents of the book which is given at its end gives added value to it, and makes its wealth of information more easily available to the student for subsequent reference. One takes pleasure in commending the work to the attention of the readers of this REVIEW.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.